VOLUME XXXVIII NUMBER 1

HOLBROOK LIBRARY PACIFIC SCHOOL OF RELIGION

THE HARVARD THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

JANUARY 1945

THE NATURE OF PROPHECY IN THE LIGHT OF RECENT STUDY . . . . . *H. H. Rowley* 1

THE ATONING WORK OF CHRIST IN THE NEW TESTAMENT . . . . . *Morton S. Enslin* 39

PAGAN DIVINE SERVICE IN LATE ANTIQUITY . . . *Martin P. Nilsson* 63

PEPYS, FULLER AND AN ARCHBISHOP . . . . . *B. J. Whiting* 71

CAMBRIDGE
HARVARD UNIVERSITY PRESS
LONDON : HUMPHREY MILFORD
OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS
1945

Issued Quarterly $3.00 a Year Single Numbers $1.00

40144

THE HARVARD THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

Issued quarterly by the Faculty of Divinity in
Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts

Editorial Committee

ARTHUR D. NOCK

WILLARD L. SPERRY
J. A. C. F. AUER

GEORGE LA PIANA
HENRY J. CADBURY

WILLIAM THOMSON

The *Harvard Theological Review* is maintained on the foundation established under the will of Mildred Everett, daughter of Charles Carroll Everett, Bussey Professor of Theology in Harvard University, 1869–1900, and Dean of the Faculty of Divinity, 1878–1900.

The scope of the Review embraces theology, ethics, the history and philosophy of religion, and cognate subjects. It aims to publish investigations, discussions, and reviews which contribute to the enlargement of knowledge or the advance of thought.

Remittances and communications on business matters should be addressed to the *Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts.*

PUBLISHED BY THE

HARVARD UNIVERSITY PRESS
PUBLISHERS OF THE LOEB CLASSICAL LIBRARY
CAMBRIDGE, MASSACHUSETTS

LONDON: HUMPHREY MILFORD
OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

Entered as second-class mail matter January 2, 1908, at the post-office at Boston, Mass. under the Act of Congress of March 3, 1879.

Acceptance for mailing at special postage rate provided for by Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on July 31, 1918.

HARVARD THEOLOGICAL REVIEW
VOLUME XXXVIII JANUARY, 1945 NUMBER 1

THE NATURE OF PROPHECY IN THE LIGHT OF RECENT STUDY[1]

H. H. ROWLEY
UNIVERSITY COLLEGE OF NORTH WALES

'THE central place in the field of Old Testament religion' says Hertzberg[2] 'is undoubtedly occupied by the prophets. It is therefore little wonder that research and investigation has concentrated ever more directly on this point: What are the prophets, and what is their significance for the spiritual development of men?' For a generation now the most keenly discussed question in this connection has been that of 'ecstasy,' and the extent to which the prophets were subject to abnormal experiences.[3] It has been held that 'ecstasy' is of the *esse* of prophecy, and that it provided a criterion without which neither the prophet nor his audience would be satisfied. Yet at best the 'ecstatic theory' could tell us only the How? rather than the What? of prophecy.

I

It was with the publication of Hölscher's Die Profeten in 1914 that the 'ecstatic' view came into prominence, though earlier writers had long recognized an 'ecstatic' element in

[1] Paper read to the Oxford Society of Historical Theology on January 28th, 1943.

[2] Prophet und Gott, 1923, p. 7.

[3] Wheeler Robinson holds that it is better to speak of abnormal experiences than of ecstatic experiences, since there were many elements besides ecstasy proper, and since ecstasy corresponds with Greek psychology rather than with Hebrew (ZAW xli, 1923, p. 2 = Redemption and Revelation, 1942, p. 140). 'The term properly applies' he says 'only to a psychology which sharply distinguishes the soul from the body, as in the Greek dualism. It ought not to be used of the phenomena of Hebrew prophecy, which is based on a very different psychology' (ibid., p. 135). In the present writer's judgment the use of the term 'ecstasy' has brought much confusion into the discussion of prophecy, but it must necessarily be used in this paper, in a discussion of the 'ecstatic theory.'

prophecy.[4] Hölscher analyzed the abnormal factors in the prophetic consciousness, and found 'ecstasy' to be characteristic of the prophets from first to last.[5] In this he has been followed by a long line of scholars of high eminence, including Gunkel,[6] Jacobi,[7] Horst,[8] Theodore Robinson,[9] Lindblom,[10] Hertzberg,[11]

[4] Mowinckel (Psalmenstudien, iii, 1923, p. 14 n.) observes that much of the material assembled by Hölscher he had himself used, and that he had drawn the same conclusions as Hölscher, in his paper 'Om nebiisme og profeti,' in Norsk Teologisk Tiddskrift, 1909, pp. 217–224, 358–360 (to which I have been unable to get access). Cf. also Giesebrecht, Die Berufsbegabung der Alttestamentlichen Propheten, 1897, pp. 38 ff.; Stade, Biblische Theologie des Alten Testaments, i, 1905, pp. 131 f. Knobel (Der Prophetismus der Hebräer, i, 1837, pp. 155 f.) had used the term 'ecstasy' of the prophets, but in a different sense. For him it meant not the lowest element in prophecy, the 'dancing dervish' element, but inner rapture of spirit. He says: 'Diese ist die höchste Stufe derselben und überhaupt der höchste Grad der Geistesregsamkeit; sie ist die Steigerung der geistigen Lebendigkeit zur höchsten Potenz.' He was therefore using the word 'esctasy' in its proper, etymological sense. Its looser use is apparently found in the Early Church, however. Cf. Lods, RHR, civ, 1931, pp. 279 f.

[5] For some parallels gathered from a wider field than usual, cf. Puukko, 'Ekstatische Propheten mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der finnisch-ugrischen Parallelen,' in ZAW, N. F. xii, 1935, pp. 23–35, and Peuckert, 'Deutsche Volkspropheten,' ibid., pp. 35–54.

[6] 'The Secret Experiences of the Prophets,' in Expositor, 9th series, i, 1924, pp. 356–366, 427–435, ii, 1924, pp. 23–32 = Die Schriften des Alten Testaments in Auswahl (SAT) II, ii, 1923, pp. xvii–xxxiv; also Die Propheten, 1917.

[7] Die Ekstase der alttestamentlichen Propheten, 1920.

[8] 'L'extase chez les prophètes d'Israël d'après les travaux de Hölscher et de Gunkel,' in RHPR, ii, 1922, pp. 337–348.

[9] 'The Ecstatic Element in Old Testament Prophecy,' in Expositor, 8th series, xxi, 1921, pp. 217–238, and Prophecy and the Prophets in Ancient Israel, 1923. Cf. also 'Die prophetischen Bücher im Lichte neuer Entdeckungen,' in ZAW, N. F. iv, 1927, pp. 3–9, and 'Neuere Propheten-Forschung,' in Theologische Rundschau, N. F. iii, 1931, pp. 75–103. Professor Robinson is the most notable exponent of the 'ecstatic theory' in English, and therefore figures largely in this paper. It will be seen below that I do not go so far in this theory as he does, while sharing it in a measure. I should like to take this opportunity of recognizing that no living British scholar has done more for the understanding of the prophets than Professor Robinson, and the measure of my debt to him greatly exceeds the measure of my disagreement.

[10] Die literarische Gattung der prophetischen Literatur, 1924. It is, however, with some modification that Lindblom follows Hölscher and Gunkel. He says: 'Nur Eins möchte ich hier betonen, nämlich dass es nicht angeht, sich den psychischen Zustand der Propheten als durchaus einheitlich und gleichartig vorzustellen. Das Wort "Ekstase" scheint in manchen Fällen dafür ein zu starkes Wort zu sein' (p. 43). Cf. id., Hosea literarisch untersucht, 1928, p. 148: 'Weil alles das für die prophetische *Frommigkeit* nicht das Wesentliche war, weil die ekstatischen Offenbarungen vielmehr nur Mittel für die Ausführung des *besonderen prophetischen Berufs* waren und also nicht der Kern ihrer Religiosität selbst, wollen wir auch nicht die grossen Propheten Israels als Mystiker bezeichnen.'

[11] Prophet und Gott, 1923.

Lods,[12] and Hackmann.[13] 'The fundamental experience of all types of prophecy is ecstasy' says Gunkel,[14] and Jacobi similarly 'Ecstasy is of the essence of prophecy.'[15] 'In its extremest form' says Theodore Robinson,[16] 'this view holds that every prophetic oracle arose out of an ecstatic experience.'

It is to be observed, however, that there is commonly a looseness and want of definition in the use of the word 'ecstasy.'[17] Thus Hölscher distinguishes sharply between the older ecstasy and the later. 'The utterance of Amos' he says[18] 'bears the characteristics of ecstatic speech — but how far removed from the older prophetic ecstasy! No stammered, half-intelligible sounds, but clear publication of divine truths. All the outer expedients, dance and music, which were still practised in the guilds of the prophets, all excited behaviour has given place to clear spiritualization.' With this may be contrasted Theodore Robinson's vivid portrayal of the process of prophecy:[19] 'We can now call before our minds a picture of the prophet's activity

[12] 'Recherches récentes sur le prophétisme israélite,' in RHR, civ, 1931, pp. 279–316, and Les prophètes d'Israël et les débuts du Judaïsme, 1935, pp. 55 ff. (= The Prophets and the Rise of Judaism, E. T. by Hooke, 1937, pp. 51 ff.).

[13] 'Die geistigen Abnormitäten der alttestamentlichen Propheten,' in Nieuw Theologisch Tijdschrift, xxiii, 1934, pp. 26–48.

[14] Expositor, 9th series, i, 1924, p. 358 = SAT II ii, 1923, p. xviii.

[15] Die Ekstase der at. lichen Propheten, 1920, p. 4: 'Die Ekstase zum Wesen des Propheten gehört.'

[16] ZAW, N.F. iv, 1927, p. 4.

[17] Cf. Povah, The Old Testament and Modern Problems in Psychology, 1926, pp. 62 f.; Porteous, Record and Revelation (ed. by H. W. Robinson), 1938, p. 228. Cf. too Mowinckel (Acta Orientalia, xiii, 1935, p. 273 n.): 'What is wrong in Hölscher's treatment of higher prophethood is, mainly, only that he stretches the word "ecstasis" too far.' Mowinckel adds that Micklem's criticism (quoted in ZAW, 1934, p. 31, n. 2) does not therefore apply to Hölscher. Had he consulted the passage in Micklem's Prophecy and Eschatology, 1926, p. 50, he would have seen that Micklem's criticism was precisely his own. 'The protagonists of the "ecstatic" view of prophecy' says Micklem, 'would appear to use the term "ecstasy" in a very wide sense. There is much in Hölscher's description of Isaiah with which it is possible largely to agree, but the use of the term "ecstasy" and the constant reference backwards to the frenzied *nebi'im* of earlier days seem to me to result in a generally distorted picture. It is Hölscher's psychology that is fundamentally inadequate.'

[18] Die Profeten, p. 197. Cf. Jacobi, op. cit., p. 14; Lods, Les prophètes, pp. 63 f. (= E. T., p. 58); also Skinner, Prophecy and Religion, 1922, pp. 220 f.

[19] Prophecy and the Prophets, p. 50. Cf. Hempel, Die althebräische Literatur und ihr hellenistisch-jüdische Nachleben, 1930, pp. 62 ff.; Hackmann, loc. cit., p. 30.

in public. He might be mingling with the crowd, sometimes on ordinary days, sometimes on special occasions. Suddenly something would happen to him. His eye would become fixed, strange convulsions would seize upon his limbs, the form of his speech would change. Men would recognize that the Spirit had fallen upon him. The fit would pass, and he would tell to those who stood around the things which he had seen and heard.' [20]

Such a view had been rejected in advance by Robertson Smith, when he declared that God 'speaks to His prophets, not in magical processes or through the visions of poor phrenetics, but by a clear intelligible word addressed to the intellect and the heart. The characteristic of the true prophet is that he retains his consciousness and self-control under revelation.' [21] Similarly Buttenwieser, writing before the publication of Hölscher's work, said: [22] 'The inspiration of the great literary prophets has nothing in common with the ecstasy of the prophets of the older type.' [23] Nor has there been any general acceptance of the extremer ecstatic theory since its formulation. It has been contested, in different ways and to a widely varying extent, by Aalders,[24] Hänel,[25] Lofthouse,[26] Micklem,[27]

[20] With this compare the view of Lindblom (Die lit. Gattung der proph. Literatur), who thinks that the prophet presented in literary form what he had learned in 'ecstasy.' Whereas Robinson divides the prophetic books into very small units, which he believes to have been separately delivered in 'ecstasy' and then translated into intelligible terms, Lindblom believes that they were literary compositions in larger units, and not 'ecstatic' utterances.

[21] The Old Testament in the Jewish Church, 1907 issue, p. 289.

[22] The Prophets of Israel, 1914, p. 138.

[23] Cf. also H. Wheeler Robinson, The Religious Ideas of the Old Testament, 1913, p. 115: 'The prophets who so profoundly transformed the religion of Israel and of the world were assuredly not men of unbalanced mind. But certain features of the prophetic writings do seem to point to an intensity of psychical experience, and therefore of temperament, which distinguishes the prophets generally from other men'; and König, in Hastings' ERE, x, 1918 (written apparently before the publication of Hölscher's work), p. 391 b: 'The prophets in question . . . give no hint of any state of ecstasy, i.e. unconsciousness or frenzy. . . . It is clear, accordingly, that the theory of ecstasy finds no support in the passages cited, while we have the positive evidence that the prophets lived an ordered life . . . and that their discourses . . . are the work of sane and sober minds.'

[24] De Profeten des Ouden Verbonds, 1918, pp. 39 ff.

[25] Das Erkennen Gottes bei den Schriftpropheten, 1923. Cf. 'Prophetische Offenbarung,' in Zeitschrift für systematische Theologie, iv, 1926–27, pp. 91–112.

[26] 'Thus hath Jahveh said,' in AJSL, xl, 1923–24, pp. 231–251.

[27] Prophecy and Eschatology, 1926, chap. i.

Junker,[28] Causse,[29] Volz,[30] Mowinckel,[31] Heschel,[32] Porteous,[33] and Irwin.[34]

That there were frenzied prophets in Israel is agreed by all, and it is frequently allowed that the canonical prophets sometimes had abnormal experiences of the types analyzed by the 'ecstatic' school.[35] Especially is this agreed in the case of Ezekiel, in whom the older 'ecstatic' element is allowed to have become prominent again.[36] But this is far from holding that 'ecstasy' was normal, or even typical, of the experiences of the greater prophets.[37] Theodore Robinson, indeed, maintains that in conceding so much the critics of the 'ecstatic' view have really conceded all.[38] Yet there is little indication that the extremer view is gaining ground, and in my judgment it is unlikely to do so. Old Testament prophecy is far too complex in nature and

[28] Prophet und Seher in Israel, 1927.

[29] 'Quelques remarques sur la psychologie des prophètes,' in RHPR, ii, 1922, pp. 349–356.

[30] Der Prophet Jeremia (in Sellin's KAT), 2nd ed., 1928, p. xxxiv.

[31] 'Ecstatic Experience and Rational Elaboration in Old Testament Prophecy,' in Acta Orientalia, xiii, 1935, pp. 264–291.

[32] Die Prophetie, 1936. Cf. p. 32, where Heschel declares ecstatic prophecy to be a *contradictio in adjecto*.

[33] 'Prophecy,' in Record and Revelation (ed. by H. W. Robinson), 1938, pp. 216–249.

[34] In J. M. P. Smith's The Prophets and their Times, 2nd ed., revised by W. A. Irwin, 1941.

[35] Cf. Skinner, Prophecy and Religion, 1922, p. 4 n.: 'The fact that the great prophets far surpassed their predecessors in their apprehension of religious truth is no reason for denying the reality of the ecstatic element in their experience, or for explaining it away as a mere rhetorical accommodation to traditional modes of expression'; Wheeler Robinson, Redemption and Revelation, pp. 143 f. (= ZAW xli, 1923, p. 5): 'There was an abnormal element in the experience of the Hebrew prophets which marked them out from their fellows. The evidence for this is well-known, and has been emphasized by Hölscher in particular, in his *Die Profeten*. It is not likely that a prophet of the classical period would have dared to prophesy without an inaugural vision such as Isaiah's in the temple, or an audition such as Jeremiah's, or such a characteristically peculiar experience as that of Ezekiel. . . . Moreover, we may expect such experiences to recur from time to time, and our expectation is fulfilled.'

[36] Cf. Mowinckel, Acta Orientalia, xiii, 1935, p. 277; Porteous, Record and Revelation, p. 230.

[37] Cf. Wheeler Robinson, The People and the Book (ed. by A. S. Peake), 1925, p. 373: 'All this does not mean necessarily that every message received and recorded in the Old Testament was given through these abnormal experiences.'

[38] Theologische Rundschau, N. F. iii, 1931, p. 85.

origin to be reduced to any single type.[39] Moreover, as Porteous says:[40] 'It is a mistake to assume *a priori* that the experience of the great prophets is directly accessible to modern psychological methods.'

II

Theodore Robinson claims that the very name *nābhî'* implies ecstatic behavior, and that it would not have been used if the prophets were not ecstatic.[41] This is inadequate, since (a) the philology is more than doubtful, and (b) words have a history as well as a derivation. It would be unsafe to argue that the derivation of the word *priest* proves that only an elderly man could be called a priest, and it is equally unsafe to assume that no non-ecstatic person could be called a *nābhî'*.

On the philological side it is incontestable that the verb *nibbā'*, *hithnabbē'*, commonly means 'to behave in an uncontrolled manner.'[42] And many actions ascribed to *n'bhî'îm* were certainly uncontrolled. The verb is used of Saul when he lost control of himself and hurled a javelin at David (1 Sam. xviii. 10), and of the prophets of Baal on Mount Carmel, when they danced about and gashed themselves with knives (1 Kgs. xviii. 28 f.), and when Saul tore off his clothes and rolled about on the ground, his behavior is described by this verb (1 Sam. xix. 24). All of the evidence of this nature contained in the Old Testament — and there is much of it — has been fully and frequently marshalled, and may be accepted without question. But that does not of itself establish the philology of the word *nābhî'*. For the verb *nibbā'*, *hithnabbē'*, is almost certainly a denominative from *nābhî'*, and the original root from which

[39] Cf. Causse (RHPR, ii, 1922, p. 350): 'C'est peut-être un peu trop simplifier les problèmes que de vouloir ainsi ramener à un fait élémentaire les mouvements très complexes qui constituent l'histoire du prophétisme hébreu.'

[40] Record and Revelation, p. 227. Cf. Causse (loc. cit., p. 351): 'Ceux qui prétendent décrire les états mentaux des hommes d'autrefois dans les termes de la psychologie contemporaine doivent prendre garde que ces états ont été exprimés dans une autre langue que la nôtre et dans un autre ordre de pensée. On ne saurait appliquer à la mentalité primitive les catégories de notre logique sans s'exposer à de graves méprises.'

[41] Expositor, loc. cit., p. 224.

[42] Häussermann (Wortempfang und Symbol in der alttestamentlichen Propheten, 1932, pp. 10 f.) distinguishes between the Niph'al, *nibbā'*, and the Hithpā'ēl, *hithnabbē'*.

nābhî' itself comes is not found in the Old Testament. Hence *nibbā'*, *hithnabbē'* simply means 'to play the *nābhî'*,' and it may well be that the admittedly 'ecstatic' connotation of the verb is quite secondary, and is due to the fact that early prophets were of the frenzied type. The fundamental meaning of the word *nābhî'* itself falls still to be considered.

By Gesenius [43] the lost primary stem of the verbal root from which *nābhî'* comes was connected with the Hebrew *nābha'* = *bubble forth*, and this view still has its advocates.[44] At best it is a doubtful hypothesis, itself deduced from the assumed original meaning of *nibbā'*, *hithnabbē'*.[45] More usually the lost root is connected with Accadian *nabû* = *call*, *announce*, and Arabic *naba'a* = *announce*. By Albright [46] the word *nābhî'* is then taken in a passive sense = *one who is called* (by God), while König [47] takes it in an active sense = *an announcer*, and Guillaume [48] finds the form to indicate that the prophet is the passive recipient of something manifested in his condition as well as in his speech = *one who is in the state of announcing a message which has been given to him*.

The etymological argument is therefore inconclusive, and there can be no certainty as to what the primary meaning of the word was. There is, however, an important passage in Ex. vii.

[43] Thesaurus linguae Hebraeae et Chaldaeae Veteris Testamenti, II, ii, 1840, p. 838 a. Cf. Stade, op. cit., i, p. 132.

[44] Cf. Hackmann, loc. cit., p. 42. Mowinckel, too, would seem to make the same connection, for he says that נבע is a 'nabiistic' term, meaning '(ekstatische) Machtwort hervorsprudeln lassen' (Psalmenstudien, i, 1921, p. 16).

[45] Cf. W. Robertson Smith, The Prophets of Israel, 2nd ed., 1912, p. 391: 'When Kuenen selects the notion of *bubbling up*, and regards the prophet as one who bubbles up under inspiration, this hypothesis has no more value than that of a guess guided by the particular development of the root idea found in נבך and נבע.'

[46] From the Stone Age to Christianity, 1940, pp. 231 f. Cf. Torczyner, ZDMG, lxxxv, 1931, p. 322: 'Das hebräische Wort bedeutet . . . gewiss nicht aktiv den "Sprecher," sondern passiv den Verzückten, vielleicht ursprünglich den vom Geist "Berufenen." '

[47] Hebräisches und Aramäisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament, 1936 ed., p. 260 b. Cf. Zimmern, in Schrader's KAT, 3rd ed., 1903, p. 400; Brockelmann, Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der semitischen Sprachen, i, 1908, § 138 b (p. 354); Häussermann, op. cit., p. 10.

[48] Prophecy and Divination, 1938, pp. 112 f. With this cf. Aalders, De Profeten des Ouden Verbonds, 1918, p. 11: 'De naam nabi' beteekent *spreker, die het woord van God vertolkt.*'

1 which reads: 'And the Lord said unto Moses, See, I have made thee a god to Pharaoh: and Aaron thy brother shall be thy prophet (*nābhî'*).'[49] With this we may compare the parallel passage in Ex. iv. 15 f. which reads: 'Thou shalt speak unto him (Aaron), and put the words in his mouth: and I will be with thy mouth, and with his mouth, and will teach you what ye shall say. And he shall be thy spokesman unto the people: and it shall come to pass, that he shall be to thee a mouth, and thou shalt be to him as God.'[50] Here the word *nābhî'* is not used, but the same prophetic relationship would seem to be in mind. These passages can in no sense establish the philological meaning of the word *nābhî'*, but they provide some evidence for the conception of the function of the *nābhî'*, and it is plain that the word carried no necessarily 'ecstatic' significance. It is concerned with the essence, not the form, of inspiration, and what it here has quite clearly in mind is one who delivers a message not his own, and not one who falls into a fit. With this we may compare Jer. xv. 19: 'If thou take forth the precious from the vile, thou shalt be as my mouth,' where again the essence of prophecy is expressed in terms of spokesmanship, and not of ecstasy.

On the side of the history of the word *nābhî'*, we have an interesting and familiar note in 1 Sam. ix. 9, which declares that 'he that is now called a prophet (*nāhhî'*) was beforetime called a seer (*rō'eh*).'[51] The meaning of this oft-quoted text is far from clear. The Septuagint has a slightly different text, yielding 'the people used to call a prophet a seer,' and this is preferred by some scholars.[52] In that case all that it means is

[49] This passage belongs to P. Jepsen (Nabi, 1934, p. 195) notes that Jer. i. 5 is the earliest passage to use *nābhî'* in the sense of *speaker*.

[50] This passage is usually attributed to J, but Eissfeldt (Hexateuch-Synopse, 1922, p. 97) assigns it to E.

[51] Morgenstern (Amos Studies, i, 1941, p. 35 n. = Hebrew Union College Annual, xi, 1936, p. 51 n.) believes this verse dates from the period preceding somewhat the time of Amos, or at least of Isaiah. It is to be noted, however, that the term *seers* stands in Isa. xxx. 10. Dhorme (Les livres de Samuel, 1910, p. 77) maintains that 1 Sam. ix. 9 is deuteronomic.

[52] So König, in Hastings' ERE, x, 1918, p. 385 a; Caspari, Die Samuelbücher (in Sellin's KAT), 1926, p. 106; Hylander, Die literarische Samuel-Saul-Komplex, 1932, p. 140 n.

that *seer* was a popular name for the *nābhî'*. In any case the text could not of itself establish that originally the seer and the *nābhî'* were two distinct types. Aalders maintains that the two terms are fully synonymous, and contests the view that these were ever two separate classes.[53] Nevertheless it is common to distinguish them, and such texts as 2 Kings xvii. 13 [54] favor this view, though the word for *seer* is there *ḥōzeh* and not *rō'eh*.[55] Theodore Robinson holds that 'the Nabi' functioned spontaneously, while the Seer worked to order,' and that 'the Nabi' was ecstatic while the Seer was not.' [56] On the other hand Mowinckel denies any psychological distinction between them.[57] It is frequently assumed that 1 Sam. ix. 9 means that from now on *seer*, whether *ḥōzeh* or *rō'eh*, and *nābhî'* were interchangeable terms. And there is some ground for the assumption. Jastrow [58] and Hänel [59] distinguish between the *ḥōzeh* and the *rō'eh*, but it is of interest to note that whereas the Chronicler describes Hanani as a *rō'eh* (2 Chron. xvi. 7), he later speaks of Jehu the son of Hanani the *ḥōzeh* (2 Chron. xix. 2). It is therefore improbable that any distinction is to be drawn,[60] and much

[53] Op. cit., pp. 11 f. Cf. Dhorme (RHR, cviii, 1933, p. 123): 'C'était (i.e. the *rō'eh*) le prophète avant la lettre.' Cf. too Junker, Prophet und Seher in Israel, p. 82; Jepsen, Nabi, pp. 43 ff.

[54] R.V.: 'Yet the Lord testified unto Israel and unto Judah by the hand of every prophet and of every seer.' This rendering follows the Vulgate in dividing the words differently from M.T.

[55] Cf. also 2 Sam. xxiv. 11: 'the prophet Gad, David's seer (*ḥōzeh*).' Here the two terms are applied to the same person, who would seem to combine the functions of both, if they are properly to be distinguished.

[56] Expositor, loc. cit., p. 220. Cf. Causse (Les plus vieux chants de la Bible, 1926, p. 124 n.): 'Son inspiration (i.e. the seer's) n'est pas extatique et orgiastique comme celle des prophètes, et son langage est généralement intelligible.' Cf. also Hölscher, Die Profeten, pp. 125 f.: 'Anders die alte Zeit; für sie ist nābī der erregte Ekstatiker, der, wo er als Vermittler übernatürlicher Offenbarungen auftritt, diese unmittelbar von sich gibt, dagegen rō'ä oder ḥōzä der Seher jeder Art, der ohne Ekstase aus mannigfachen äusseren Beobachtungen und Wahrnehmungen, unter denen die Illusionen des nächtlichen Dunkels, des Halbschlafs und Traumes besonders bevorzugt sind, übernatürliches Wissen gewinnt. . . . Wie sich der "Seher" der alten Zeit vom "Profeten" unterscheidet, so hat er auch mit der ekstatischen Vision von Hause aus nichts zu tun.'

[57] Psalmenstudien, iii, 1923, p. 20.

[58] 'Rô'ēh und Ḥôzēh,' in JBL, xxviii, 1909, pp. 42–56.

[59] Das Erkennen Gottes, pp. 7 ff. Cf. Häussermann, op. cit., pp. 4 ff.

[60] Cf. Oudenrijn, 'De vocabulis quibusdam, termino נָבִיא synonymis,' in Biblica,

more likely, as Oudenrijn suggests,[61] that *ḥōzeh* is of Aramaic origin [62] and *rō'eh* of Arabic origin. If, then, these terms are to be equated, we may next observe that there are some cases of the same person being called a *nābhî'* and a *ḥōzeh*,[63] and that Amos, whose work is included amongst the collection of *Nᵉbhî'îm*, is described as a *ḥōzeh* (Am. vii. 12), while Jehu, the son of the above-mentioned Hanani, is himself described as a *nābhî'* (1 Kings xvi. 7, 12).

Theodore Robinson interprets 1 Sam. ix. 9 to mean that 'during the early monarchy the Seer properly so called disappeared, and that his characteristics and functions were assumed by the Nabi' or Ecstatic.'[64] But it is hard to see how this meaning can be attached to the text, and simpler to interpret it to mean that the term *nābhî'* had come to be used indiscriminately for two different classes of men, the original *nābhî'* and the *seer*, if these were once distinct.[65] If the seer had ceased to exist as a type, there would have been no need to restyle him a *nābhî'* or indeed to call him anything at all. Moreover, we actually find the term *rō'îm*, or *seers*, in Isa. xxx. 10, used of contemporary persons. Apparently there continued to be religious persons of the type once distinguished from the *nᵉbhî'îm* as *seers*, but a less precise age failed to distinguish them by name. To say this is to say that the mere fact that a person is called a *nābhî'* leaves entirely unsettled whether he properly belonged to the one or to the other variety, and still more whether he was 'ecstatic' or 'non-ecstatic.' Robinson holds that Samuel was a seer and not a *nābhî'*, and declares that there is no sugges-

---

vi, 1925, pp. 294–311, 406–417. Cf. too Lindblom, Die lit. Gattung der proph. Literatur, p. 39 n.: 'Von diesem Gesichtspunkt aus kann ich keinen Unterschied zwischen den beiden Begriffen *ḥāzā* und *rā'ā* finden.'

[61] Loc. cit., pp. 304 f. Cf. Driver, Problems of the Hebrew Verbal System, 1936, p. 99. Oudenrijn points out, however, that the root ḥz' is used of mantic vision in ancient Arabic. Cf. Wellhausen, Reste arabischen Heidentums, 2nd ed., 1897, p. 135 n.

[62] Oudenrijn notes that we find חזי = *seers* in the Zakir inscription (a: 12; cf. Lidzbarski, Ephemeris für semitische Epigraphik, iii, 1909–15, p. 3).

[63] So Gad, 1 Sam. xxii. 5 and 2 Sam. xxiv. 11, 1 Chron. xxi, 9, xxix. 29, 2 Chron. xxix. 25; Iddo, 2 Chron. xiii. 22 and ix. 29, xii. 15.

[64] Prophecy and the Prophets, p. 35.

[65] Cf. Van Hoonacker, Les douze petits prophètes, 1908, p. 269.

tion of abnormal behavior on his part.[66] Yet since Samuel is called a *nābhî'*, this is to admit that the term *nābhî'* cannot be held to prove of itself that the person it denotes was an 'ecstatic.'

Still less can it establish the 'ecstatic' character of the experience that belonged to every prophetic utterance.[67] Theodore Robinson says 'The "dabar" was not simply a subjective conviction, however strong, as to the will of God. An objective criterion is necessarily demanded both by the speaker and by the hearers, both by the prophet and by his audience. Failure to recognize this essential feature of prophecy is to misunderstand the mind of ancient Israel.' [68] Here it is clear from the context that what is meant is an objective criterion of the prophet's reception of the message, not an objective criterion of the soundness of the contents of the oracle. In the light of this claim we may examine the story of Nathan's interview with David after the adultery with Bathsheba (2 Sam. xii. 1 ff.). The prophet related the story of the rich man's seizure of the poor man's one ewe lamb. Since the king understood the story to be a literal statement of fact, it is quite unnecessary to suppose that Nathan had to give evidence of prophetic inspiration before he related it. It is equally unnecessary to suppose that the prophet was seized with convulsions before he could say 'Thou art the man,' since it was now clear that this had been the pur-

[66] Expositor, loc. cit., p. 220. Cf. Lofthouse, in The People and the Book, p. 250. With this contrast Mowinckel (Psalmenstudien, iii, p. 11), who says the Seer was ecstatic. It is also to be noted that 1 Sam. xix. 20 represents Samuel as the head of a group of 'ecstatics,' whose frenzied abandon was shared by Saul.

[67] Cf. Hempel, Gott und Mensch im Alten Testament, 1936, p. 97 n.: 'Das anderseits freilich nicht alle profetischen Erlebnisse ekstatischer Natur sind ist ohne weiteres deutlich.' Cf. Causse, RHPR, ii, 1922, p. 350: 'Le prophétisme a bien commencé là (with ecstasy). Mais s'il en était resté à ces rudiments primitifs et grossiers, il serait à jamais passé sans laisser de souvenir, il n'aurait pas fait vivre le monde.'

[68] Expository Times, xlvi, 1934–35, p. 43. With this cf. Marti, The Religion of the Old Testament, E. T. by Bienemann, 1907, p. 183: 'The test of the prophet is therefore not the form in which the divine operation manifests itself — neither ecstasy nor cataleptic attacks, neither trances nor "hearing words" and "seeing visions" — but the contents of his message.' Cf. too Weinrich, Der religiös-utopische Charakter der prophetischen Politik, 1932, p. 15: 'Die Ekstase als solche ist für das prophetische Bewusstsein nicht das Entscheidende, die Ekstase als solche verbürgt nicht die Echtheit des Propheten und seines Wortes.'

pose of the telling of the story from the start.[69] It would, of course, be possible to suppose that it was as the result of some 'ecstatic' experience that Nathan set out to interview the king,[70] but that could hardly authenticate his message for his hearer. In short, it is hard to see where there is room for any 'ecstatic' experience which could serve as a criterion both to the prophet and to his hearer, to prove that his message was from God.

III

Recent study has emphasized the variety of prophets in Israel, and it is no longer possible to be content with just two, *seer* and *nābhî'*.[71] The seer is found, perhaps attached to a shrine, where he may be consulted for a fee about private problems, as in the case of Samuel at Ramah (1 Sam. ix, 6 ff.), or Ahijah at Shiloh (1 Kings xiv. 1 ff.).[72] On the other hand, he may be attached to the court, as in the case of Gad, David's seer (2 Sam. xxiv. 11), or consulted by the king about national problems (2 Kings iii. 11), or consulted in his own home about

[69] It may be recalled that in another case where a prophet similarly trapped a king into self-judgment by a story (1 Kings xx. 35 ff.), before the oracle was delivered he 'took the headband away from his eyes; and the king of Israel discerned that he was of the prophets.' Clearly here the prophet had some external mark to distinguish him, and it was essential to conceal it to allay any suspicion, and equally necessary to expose it for the utterance of the oracle. Something similar may have happened in the case of Nathan. But that was an objective criterion that the man was a prophet, not that he had received this particular oracle.

[70] Cf. Expositor, 8th series, xxi, 1921, p. 235, where Robinson explains the interviews of Isaiah with Ahaz, and Amos with Amaziah by the suggestion that the oracles they contain were delivered to the prophet in the 'ecstatic' state, and recalled and repeated by him in calmer moments.

[71] Cf. S. A. Cook, The Old Testament: a Reinterpretation, 1936, p. 168, and CAH, iii, 1925, pp. 458 f.

[72] It is far from certain, indeed, that Ahijah was attached to a shrine at Shiloh. The Danish excavations there have made it practically certain that, as had long been surmized (cf. Ewald, Geschichte des Volkes Israel, 2nd ed., ii, 1853, p. 540), the city was destroyed in the eleventh century, doubtless when the Philistines captured the Ark (cf. H. Kjaer, 'The Danish Excavation of Shiloh,' in PEFQS, 1927, pp. 202–213, and 'Shiloh, a Summary Report of the second Danish Expedition, 1929,' ibid., 1931, pp. 71–88; Mallon, 'Les fouilles danoises de Silo,' in Biblica, x, 1929, pp. 369–375). That it was not totally uninhabited is doubtless true, though the archaeological evidence suggests that its occupation was negligible for some centuries, in which case it is unlikely that there was any shrine there.

private matters (2 Kings v. 9). The *nābhî'* may be found alone by the wayside, as when Nathan waylaid David (2 Sam. xii. 1), or the unnamed prophet waylaid Ahab (1 Kings xx. 38), or Elijah met Ahab (1 Kings xxi. 17 ff.); or he may be found in company with others, as in the case of the band of prophets who met Saul near Gibeah (1 Sam. x. 5, 10), or the band with Samuel at Ramah (1 Sam. xix. 18 ff.), or those who dwelt at Bethel (2 Kings ii. 3), or at Jericho (2 Kings ii. 5), or at Gilgal (2 Kings iv. 38); or yet again, bodies of *nᵉbhî'îm* may be found attached to the court, as in the case of the Baal *nᵉbhî'îm*, who were maintained at Jezebel's expense (1 Kings xviii. 19), or the four hundred who encouraged Ahab to go up to Ramoth Gilead (1 Kings xxii. 6), or attached to the Temple (Jer. xxiii. 11, xxvi. 7, Lam. ii. 20). Sometimes the oracles were supplied to order, as in the consultation of the seers, or as in the royal consultation of the prophets by Ahab, while on other occasions the initiative lay with the prophets.[73] Sometimes the oracle rested on a dream (Num. xii. 6, Jer. xxiii. 28); sometimes it was induced by music (2 Kings iii. 15; cf. 1 Sam. x. 5); sometimes wine may have been used to induce the 'ecstatic' state (cf. Isa. xxviii. 7, Mic. ii. 11).

Attention has been drawn in recent years to the probability that there were cultic prophets, attached to the shrines alongside the priests, and that so far from prophet and priest being exponents of opposed types of religion, they long flourished side by side as fellow officials of the cultus. It was Mowinckel who first drew attention to this question,[74] but he is now more largely followed in the recognition of cultic prophets.[75] Of

[73] It is interesting to observe that the document which represents Samuel as a seer, ascribes to his divinely inspired initiative the establishment of the monarchy, whereas the other document, which represents him as a figure of national eminence, says that the initiative lay with the people, who merely applied to Samuel to divine for them the right man. It would seem that hard and fast lines cannot be drawn between the different prophetic functions, and more than one individual seems to have combined more than one variety of function.

[74] Kultprophetie und prophetische Psalmen (Psalmenstudien iii), 1923. Cf. however already Jacobi, op. cit., 1920, p. 4: 'Dieses alte Sehertum berührte sich nahe mit dem Priestertum.'

[75] Cf. Causse, 'L'ancienne poésie cultuelle d'Israël et les origines du Psautier,' in RHPR, vi, 1926, pp. 1–37, and Les plus vieux chants de la Bible, chap. iii; Povah,

British scholars Aubrey Johnson has studied the question, on which he has published a short paper,[76] but on which he is preparing some larger monographs, of which the first is now completed, but not yet published.[77] It is pointed out by the advocates of this view that Samuel was found in the shrine of Ramah, where he presided at the sacrificial meal (1 Sam. ix. 13, 22 f.), and that there are a number of passages which connect the prophet and the priest together in relation to the sanctuary,[78] as though they were joint officials of the shrine (Jer. xxiii. 11, xxvi. 7, Lam. ii. 20). The prophetic bands, or guilds,[79] are chiefly mentioned in connection with places where there are known to have been shrines, and may have been attached to these shrines,[80] while the court prophets of Ahab may have been attached to one of the royal shrines. While there is much evidence of this kind, to suggest that cultic persons of various kinds, referred to under the general term prophets, were associated with the shrines, for individual or corporate consultation, or for group activity, we must beware of outrunning the evidence, or of supposing that a theory of cultic prophets is more than a theory. For it may be noted that in the narrative which tells us of Samuel's presiding at the sacrificial

---

The Old Testament and Modern Problems in Psychology, 1926, pp. 67 ff.; Junker, Prophet und Seher in Israel, 1927; Hylander, 'War Jesaja Nabi?' in Le monde oriental, xxv, 1931, pp. 53–66; von Rad, 'Die falschen Propheten,' in ZAW, N. F. x, 1933, pp. 109–120; Eissfeldt, Einleitung in das Alte Testament, 1934, pp. 115 ff.; Jepsen, Nabi, 1934, pp. 143 ff., 191 ff.; Graham and May, Culture and Conscience, 1936, pp. 170, 217.

[76] 'The Prophet in Israelite Worship,' in Expository Times, xlvii, 1935–36, pp. 312–319.

[77] I am indebted to Dr. Johnson for his kindness in allowing me to see this study, which is to be published under the title The Cultic Prophet in Ancient Israel. (This has now appeared, in 1944.)

[78] Jepsen (Nabi, p. 161) notes that there are thirty passages which refer to priests and prophets in friendly association, all in Jerusalem or Judah.

[79] On these guilds cf. Oudenrijn, 'L'expression "fils des prophètes" et ses analogies,' in Biblica, vi, 1925, pp. 165–171. He notes that the term 'sons of the prophets' is only attested for the period circa 850–750 B.C., and only for the northern kingdom, and thinks they were members of a specifically northern prophetic brotherhood. Cf. also Junker, Prophet und Seher in Israel, for a study of the cultic significance of these brotherhoods.

[80] Cf. Junker (op. cit., p. 33): 'Überhaupt sind alle Orte, die als Sitz von Priestervereinen erwähnt werden, Kultorte, wie ausser Rama noch Gabaa, Jericho und Gilgal.'

feast in Ramah (1 Sam. ix. 1 ff.) the seer or prophet is said to have told Saul to await him in Gilgal, where he would come to offer sacrifices (1 Sam. x. 8). This would suggest that he was not necessarily of the personnel attached to the particular shrines where he is found. Since prophets were religious persons, devotees of their God, it is natural to find them in the shrines in which religion centered. But that does not make them members of the staff of the shrines. Elijah offered sacrifice on Mount Carmel on an altar which he built, or rebuilt, but there is no reason to suppose that he belonged to the personnel of that or any other shrine. Similarly we find Amos prophesying in the shrine at Bethel, where it is impossible to suppose him to have been a cultic prophet attached to that shrine. When we find other prophets mentioned in association with shrines, therefore, we must not too hastily conclude that they belonged to their staff.[81] Moreover, where we read of groups of prophets residing at Ramah or at Gilgal, where shrines are known to have existed, or coming down from Gibeah, where there was a shrine, this does not necessarily mean that they were functionaries of these shrines. In the case of Gibeah, the prophets were found exercising their function on the road coming away from the shrine, and not at the shrine itself. Again, a group of prophets resided at Jericho (2 Kings ii. 5), which had only recently been re-walled (1 Kings xvi. 34). While the site had doubtless been occupied to some extent, it had not been the centre of any important settlement for many years, and there is no reason to suppose that it had an important, and

[81] Johnson says (Expository Times, loc. cit., p. 315 a): 'The evidence points to the fact that their (i.e. the Baal prophets') rivals held a similar position in the cultus of Jahweh, and were *stationed*, in the form of the so-called guilds, at the different *sanctuaries* throughout the country (cf. 2 Kgs. ii. 3, 5 etc.).' The words which I have italicized seem to me to go beyond the evidence. I should add that in private correspondence Dr. Johnson agrees that the word 'stationed' is too strong, and that the cultic prophets should not be thought of as in any sense resident at the shrines. I should also make it clear that he does not suggest that Elijah was a cultic prophet of the Carmel shrine, or Amos of the Bethel shrine, and that I only adduce these examples to show that prophetic activity at a shrine does not provide sure evidence of cultic prophecy. Jepsen tends to outrun the evidence in a different direction. He says (Nabi, p. 162): 'Die nordisraelitischen Nabis halten also weder am Hof noch an der Priesterschaft einen Rückhalt.' So far as the time of Ahab is concerned this is not true of the court.

largely staffed, shrine. Hence I would suggest reserve in connecting the prophets as closely with particular shrines as the priests, while welcoming the emphasis on their association with cultic centres.

They were not alone interested in the cultus, however, but in political affairs. For politics and religion were intimately related. When the nation was under the Philistine heel, the national religion was threatened and the national God dishonored, and therefore the devotees of God and of the cultus through which He was worshipped were behind the national resurgence. It was Samuel, the seer, who encouraged Saul to take the lead, and the bands of frenzied prophets who kindled the ardor of the people. Later it was Ahijah who instigated Jeroboam to head the northern revolt (1 Kings xi. 29 ff.), and Elisha who sent a member of one of the prophetic bands to promote the revolution of Jehu (2 Kings ix. 1 ff.).

IV

The relation of the greater canonical prophets to any of these varieties of prophet provides a further question. Frequently they denounce the prophets as faithless misleaders of the people (Hos. ix. 7, Isa. xxviii. 7, Mic. iii. 5, 11, Jer. xxiii. 9 ff., xxix. 21, Ezk. xiii. 17 ff.), and it might be supposed that they did not regard themselves as having any part or lot in them. Amos is commonly understood to say in so many words that he is neither a prophet nor a member of a prophetic guild (Am. vii. 14).[82] Yet when he describes what God called him to do, he uses the word *nibbā'* = *play the prophet*. Theodore Robinson argues that his use of this word proves that he was an ecstatic,[83] while Morgenstern holds that unless he had coined a new word, which would have been far better, he was bound to use this word, inadequate as it was, since it was the only one available.[84] While I have indicated much reserve on the question of the extent to which 'ecstasy' marked prophecy,

[82] On this, however, see below.

[83] Expositor, loc. cit., p. 224.

[84] Amos Studies, i, pp. 32 ff. = HUCA, loc. cit., pp. 48 ff.

I wholly agree with Robinson that the difference between the greater prophets and the men they denounced should not be exaggerated. Clearly to the outward eye there was no manifest difference,[85] and 'ecstasy' marked the one group as much, or as little, as the other. Nor can it be argued that the non-professional character of the canonical prophets differentiated them from the others. Had it been merely that the canonical prophets were 'non-ecstatic,' while those they denounced were 'ecstatic,' or that they were non-professional, while the others were professional prophets, we should have expected the fact to be far more clearly indicated. Amos prophesied in the Bethel shrine, and Jeremiah not alone prophesied in the Jerusalem Temple, but the exiles in Babylonia wrote to the Jerusalem priests to complain that they did not maintain a proper discipline over him (Jer. xxix. 26 f.). Mowinckel, indeed, believes that Jeremiah belonged to the Temple personnel.[86] So far as Isaiah is concerned, we know that he met Ahaz (Isa. vii. 3 ff.), much as Nathan had met David or Elijah Ahab, that Hezekiah sent to consult him (Isa. xxxvii. 2) much as Josiah later sent to consult Huldah (2 Kings xxii. 14), and that he visited Hezekiah in his sickness and brought him a prophetic word (Isa. xxxviii. 1). No difference of status as compared with the prophets from whom it is usual to distinguish them can be established, and Mowinckel [87] and Porteous [88] think they may have come from their ranks. Moreover, the inner cleavage between the prophets first appears with Micaiah (1 Kings xxii). Yet there it is clear that Micaiah is a prophet in the same sense as the other four hundred. Similarly when Jeremiah, wearing his wooden yoke, confronts Hananiah in the Temple (Jer. xxviii. 1 ff.), it is clearly a conflict between two men who claim a like status.

Mowinckel [89] and Obbink [90] distinguish between the false

[85] Cf. Robinson, loc. cit.

[86] Acta Orientalia, xiii, p. 267; also JBL, liii, 1934, p. 210, where he adds the suggestion that Isaiah was also probably a member of the same personnel. For the latter cf. Hylander, Le monde oriental, xxv, 1931, pp. 64 f.

[87] JBL, loc. cit., p. 206 n.

[88] In Record and Revelation, p. 233.

[89] '"The Spirit" and the "Word" in the Pre-exilic Reforming Prophets,' in JBL, liii, 1934, pp. 199–227. In the course of this paper Mowinckel says that the great re-

prophets and the true by finding the former to be 'ecstatic' and the latter not.[91] Jepsen makes a similarly sharp distinction, though he denies that the *nᵉbhî'îm* in Israel were 'ecstatic' in the frenzied sense. I have already said that I find it difficult to suppose that any such clear-cut distinction could be made between them.[92] The difference between false and true belongs not to the outer conduct, that the eye of any child might discern, but to the realm of the spirit, where even the trained observer is not infallible. The fundamental complaint made against the false prophets by the great prophets whose words have come down to us was that they prophesied smooth things, the things that men wanted to hear, crying Peace and Prosperity! when their message sprang but from wishful thinking, and not from divine inspiration. It is not necessary to suppose that they were always insincere, though insincerity is sometimes laid to their charge. When Jeremiah accuses them of stealing one another's oracles (Jer. xxiii. 30), a charge of insincerity would seem to be implied, since they were giving second-hand messages in a calling that professed to deal in

---

forming prophets had experiences of an 'ecstatic' character (p. 214), and that the 'ecstatic' element was a criterion of prophecy (p. 215), but he contrasts the 'elevated' character of their experience and utterance with the crude 'ecstasy' of the *nᵉbhî'îm* (pp. 207 f.). Cf. JBL, lvi, 1937, pp. 261–265, where in a postscript to the above article, Mowinckel says he would then have emphasized the 'ecstatic' element in the prophets even less.

[90] 'The Forms of Prophetism,' in HUCA, xiv, 1939, pp. 23–28, especially p. 26: 'These prophets deny any relationship with the so-called *nebi'im*, the ecstatic bands of Canaanite prophets.'

[91] Cf. Grether, Name und Wort Gottes im Alten Testament, 1934, p. 102: 'Der Kampf Jeremias mit den Nebiim ist formal betrachtet ein Kampf gegen das Ekstatische am Nabitum.' Albright (From the Stone Age to Christianity, p. 233) thinks the Yahwistic movement may have arisen partly as a reaction against pagan ecstaticism. Cf. Guillaume, Prophecy and Divination, p. 293: 'There is an obvious parallel between Hebrew and heathen ecstatics. But this is a fact without great significance. . . . The more they resemble one another the greater the difference.'

[92] Cf. Porteous, loc. cit., p. 233: 'It is difficult to believe that Jepsen is right in making the cleavage between *nebi'im* and canonical prophets as absolute as he does.' Cf. also Lods, (Les prophètes d'Israël, p. 64 =) The Prophets and the Rise of Judaism, p. 59: 'The new prophets, if they noticed any differences at all between themselves and their predecessors or contemporaries, looked upon them as very slight. The great prophets *knew of no exterior sign by which the genuinely inspired of Jahweh could be distinguished*'; Skinner, Prophecy and Religion, 1922, p. 188: 'In externals there was nothing to distinguish the one kind of prophet from the other.'

the first-hand oracles of God.[93] Micah, too, charges them with giving oracles dictated by the fee they received (Mic. iii. 5 ff.), where again there is a clear implication of insincerity. But insincerity is not always transparent, and such a charge may be more easily believed than proved. And since the differences claimed by the greater prophets belonged to that intangible realm of the spirit, it is gratuitous to assume that there was an obvious difference of behavior, which yet finds no clear mention.

V

Mowinckel maintains that the great pre-exilic prophets do not claim to be possessed by the spirit of God, but to have the word of God,[94] and he attaches considerable significance to this distinction. He says: 'That their own prophetic vocation and their possession of Yahweh's wondrous word come of their having Yahweh's spirit in them is never suggested by so much as a syllable.' [95] Indeed, he observes, there are passages where they seem to deprecate the spirit as the organ of revelation. Thus Hos. ix. 7 says: 'The prophet is a fool, the man that hath the spirit is mad'; Mic. ii. 11 describes the prophet as a man walking in wind and falsehood, where there may be some play on the double meaning of *rûaḥ* — the wind or the spirit — and the suggestion that the spirit produces mere windiness; Jer. v. 13 declares that 'the prophets shall become wind, and the word is not in them,' where again there may be some suggestion of the emptiness of the spirit which possesses them; and Zech. xiii. 3 associates the prophets with the spirit of uncleanness.[96]

[93] Cf. Jer. xiv. 14, xxiii. 32, where Jeremiah charges them with prophesying lying visions and the deceit of their own heart.

[94] JBL, loc. cit. Cf. Häussermann (op. cit., p. 24): 'Die klassischen Propheten verzichten auf solche Mittel. Überhaupt ist bei ihnen von der רוח selten die Rede. Häufiger begegnet uns der Ausdruck wieder bei Ezechiel.' For the place of the 'Word' in prophecy, and especially in the thought of Jeremiah, cf. Hertzberg, Prophet und Gott, 1923, pp. 83 ff. Cf. too Grether, Name und Wort Gottes im Alten Testament, 1934, where it is argued that the word of God is a separate category of revelation, to be distinguished from dream, vision, audition and ecstasy, and that though the word may have been associated with some abnormal experience it was never mediated merely through it, apart from the conscious coöperation of the recipient.

[95] JBL, loc. cit., p. 201.

[96] Cf. Mowinckel, ibid., pp. 204 ff.

In Mic. iii. 8, however, as the text now stands, Micah claims the possession of the spirit of Yahweh. The R. V. renders: 'But I truly am full of power by the spirit of the Lord, and of judgement and of might.' It has, however, long been held that syntax and rhythm alike show that the words rendered 'by the spirit of the Lord' do not belong to the text,[97] and there is therefore good ground for ignoring the passage in this connection.

With Ezekiel Mowinckel finds a return to the thought of the spirit as the medium of revelation. Thus in Ezk. xi. 5 we have: 'And the spirit of the Lord fell upon me, and he said unto me, Speak.' In later prophets there is frequently found this thought of the spirit as the medium of revelation, as in Isa. xlviii. 16: 'And now the Lord God hath sent me, and his spirit'; Isa. lxi. 1: 'The spirit of the Lord God is upon me'; Joel ii. 28 (Heb. iii. 1): 'I will pour out my spirit upon all flesh; and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy.' There are, however, some passages in proto-Isaiah which imply a similar thought, such as Isa. xi. 2: 'The spirit of the Lord shall rest upon him, the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and might, the spirit of knowledge and of the fear of the Lord'; Isa. xxviii. 6: 'And for a spirit of judgment to him that sitteth in judgment'; Isa. xxxii. 15: 'Until the spirit be poured upon us from on high.' All of these passages, however, whose attribution to Isaiah has been questioned in other quarters and on other grounds, Mowinckel assigns to later dates.[98]

How far the sharpness of this distinction can be maintained is doubtful, and I do not think any of the great prophets would have directly repudiated the spirit of God as the medium of their inspiration. In the story of the first cleavage amongst the prophets, Micaiah says 'Hear thou the *word* of the Lord' when he delivers his message (1 Kings xxii. 19), and speaks of a *spirit* that stood before the Lord entering Zedekiah and the other prophets (xxii. 21 ff.); but the story begins with Jehoshaphat's request to Ahab: 'Inquire, I pray thee, at the *word* of

[97] So Wellhausen, Die kleinen Propheten, 2nd ed., 1893, p. 138; Nowack, Die kleinen Propheten, 1897, p. 203; Marti, Dodekapropheton, 1904, p. 279; Sellin, Das Zwölfprophetenbuch, 2nd ed., 1929, p. 326.

[98] JBL, loc. cit., pp. 201 f. note.

the Lord' (xxii. 5). Both sides dealt in what claimed to be the word of the Lord, and it is probable that both claimed to be possessed by the spirit of the Lord. But Micaiah declared the possibility of possession by a lying spirit, sent from God Himself, and what his successors seem to have meant was that it was necessary to test the spirits. They frequently stigmatize prophecies as lies, and it is probable that their complaint was not that they were born of the spirit, but that they were born of a false spirit. Whether possession by the spirit manifested itself in 'ecstasy' or merely in earnestness, it was insufficient. That kind of test could only be applied to the reception or delivery of a message, and could not of itself guarantee the truth of its revelation. The truth belonged to the content, and there alone it could be tested and shown to be the veritable word of God. For the true prophets are Yahweh's spokesmen, not His ravers.

It seems to me that this is getting down much more deeply to the nature of Old Testament prophecy than any concern with mere 'ecstasy.' For whatever divergence of view there may be as to the extent of the abnormality of the greater prophets, there is none as to its prevalence in earlier times, or its manifestation in the prophets of Baal. Hence the essence of true prophecy cannot be sought in something which it has in common with other prophecy.

There are not wanting, however, those who would deny any distinction, so far as 'truth' is concerned, between the rival groups of prophets. Thus Graham and May declare that they were but complementary factors in conditioning the flow of the tide of life which swept them all on to destiny, and that the distinction between them was not one of truth or virtue, but something that lay more in the realm of social function than in morals or philosophy,[99] while Hoschander would prefer rather to reverse the rôles usually assigned to the two groups.[100] He divides the prophets into priestly prophets and non-priestly prophets, and finds the former to be those who are called false

[99] Culture and Conscience, 1936, pp. 214 f. Cf. also Graham, The Prophets and Israel's Culture, 1934.

[100] The Priests and Prophets, 1936, chap. ii.

prophets by Jeremiah. But these priestly prophets, who included Joel and Ezekiel, are held to be superior to Jeremiah and his like. For the latter were only interested in morals, whereas the priestly prophets were interested in morals and ritual, and instead of striving after the naked truth, in all the indecency of its nakedness, they sought to dress it attractively in a becoming garment of falsehood, and showed altogether more realism than the purely idealistic prophets, whose effectiveness was destroyed by their idealism.[101] Neither of these views seems to me to penetrate deeply enough into the spirit and essence of prophecy.

VI

Whether or not *nābhî'* means *called*, as Albright holds, every prophet was conscious of a vocation, and this is the first fundamental characteristic of true prophecy.[102] How the members of the prophetic guilds, whether cultic officials or not, were recruited we do not know. Guillaume believes that membership was hereditary,[103] and this may well be a part of the truth. In the case of the seer Samuel, we are told that he was dedicated by his parents in his infancy to the service of the shrine (1 Sam. i. 28), and if there is substance in the view that seers were stationed at shrines, this narrative may not be misleading in its suggestion that parental dedication may have been one source of recruitment. It should be stated, however, that the narrative is held by some to have been transferred from a Saul saga

[101] For a criticism of the unpractical idealism of the greater prophets in the realm of statesmanship, cf. Weinrich, Der religiös-utopische Charakter der "prophetischen Politik," 1932, and on the other side Elliger, 'Prophet und Politik,' in ZAW, N. F. xii, 1935, pp. 3–22.

[102] Cf Albright, Archaeology and the Religion of Israel, 1942, p. 24: 'The central fact of the prophet's consciousness remained thenceforth the memory of that transforming experience, as a result of which he was under special commission from Yahweh to preach to his people.' Cf. too Dennefeld, Introduction à l'Ancien Testament, 1934, pp. 151 f.: 'Chaque *nabi'* était appelé directement par Dieu. . . . Le don prophétique était toujours un privilège personnel spécialement accordé par Dieu; il ne reposait pas, comme le sacerdoce, sur un titre héréditaire et ne provenait ni d'une prédisposition naturelle ni d'une préparation scolaire.'

[103] Prophecy and Divination, 1938, p. 124.

to a Samuel saga.[104] It is commonly connected with the older cycle of Samuel stories, in which Samuel is described as a seer, but we find that in its immediate sequel he is called a prophet (1 Sam. iii. 20). That sequel is of importance for our purpose, since it is clearly held that what made him a genuine prophet was not parental dedication, but the fact that when he was still a child the word of God came to him by divine initiative. We are not given the account of the 'call' of every one of the greater prophets, but we have enough evidence to reach the reasonable conclusion that their careers began in an experience of inescapable constraint.[105]

Moses is in some passages called a prophet (Num. xii. 6 ff., Dt. xviii. 15, xxxiv. 10, Hos. xii. 13 (Heb. 14)).[106] There is nothing to suggest that he was of the crudely 'ecstatic' type, but if we rightly find prophecy to lie in the mediation of the word of God, there are few Old Testament characters who can lay better claim to the title.[107] For however little of the detail of our knowledge of his work modern critical study may leave us, the prophetic stature of the man who led Israel out of Egypt, and brought them to commit themselves by a voluntarily accepted bond to a God whose name was hitherto unknown to them is little diminished. And the familiar story of the call of Moses represents it as something he tried in vain to resist (Ex. iii. 11 ff.). By whatever psychological theory his reported dialogue with God may be interpreted, its substance is an inescapable certainty that God would not take No for an answer.

Amos declares that he had to prophesy because God took him from following the flock, and said 'Go, prophesy' (Am. vii.

[104] Cf. Lods, Israël des origines au milieu du viii[e] siècle, 1930, p. 411 (= E. T. by Hooke, 1932, pp. 354 f.); Hylander, Der literarische Samuel-Saul-Komplex, 1932, p. 13.

[105] Cf. Mowinckel, JBL, loc. cit., p. 211: 'This prophetic call is not merely felt to be a *certainty*, it is upon them and in them as a *compelling force* from which they cannot escape.' Cf. id., Acta Orientalia, xiii, 1935, p. 270.

[106] Mowinckel (Psalmenstudien, iii, p. 10) holds that Moses was really a seer, and that the representation of him as a *nābhî'* is late.

[107] Cf. Marti, The Religion of the Old Testament, E. T. by Bienemann, 1907, pp. 63 f.: 'He is the first in the series of those great men of Israel whom we call prophets. . . . He is only rightly understood when he is conceived as a prophet.'

14 f.), and the constraint was as irresistible as the catch of the heart on hearing the roar of the lion (Am. iii. 8). I do not think Amos really repudiates the title of prophet, as is so often supposed.[108] When Amaziah scornfully told him to go and prophesy in Judah, where he could make a living out of it, he indignantly replied that he was not a prophet because he wanted to get a living by it, but because he had to be. 'God took me,' he says, 'a man who belonged to no prophetic order, and compelled me to prophesy.' For the authentication of his prophetic status he appeals to his experience of vocation, not to his choice of a profession, or to the fact that he was as susceptible as others to 'ecstatic' experiences.

Hosea found his call in an act to which he was inescapably drawn (Hos. i. 2). Into the much discussed question of the marriage or marriages of Hosea, it is unnecessary here to enter,[109] but I think the view that Gomer was a temple prostitute,

[108] Am. vii. 14 is translated by most 'I am no prophet or prophet's son (= member of a prophetic guild),' and the verse is taken to be an indignant denial of prophetic status by Amos. The Hebrew is a noun sentence, and some part of the verb *to be* must be supplied. Cripps (A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Amos, 1929, p. 233) quite incorrectly says that the insertion of the *present* tense is alone in accordance with Hebrew usage. Sellin (Das Zwölfprophetenbuch, 1929, p. 254), while himself preferring the present, agrees that the *past* tense, as found in the Septuagint, the Syriac, and R. V., is equally possible grammatically. Actually it is to be preferred on grammatical grounds, for while a noun sentence in itself may be past, present, or future, in this case it is followed by consecutive *waw* and the imperfect. Hence 'and the Lord said unto me, Go, prophesy' is most naturally, though not necessarily, taken as following 'I no prophet or prophet's son' in the temporal sequence. Cf. Jerome (Migne, PL, xxv, 1845, col. 1077): 'non sum propheta, sive non eram (quorum alterum humilitatis, alterum veritatis est)'; Kimḥi (ad loc., cf. the Amsterdam Rabbinical Bible, 1724–27, iii, folio 287 b): נביא מנעורי לא הייתי = 'I was not a prophet from my youth'; Rosenmüller (Scholia in Vetus Testamentum, VII ii, 2nd ed., 1827, p. 207): 'Non propheta ego *fui* (הייתי) *ab initio*'; Riedel (TSK, lxxvi, 1903, p. 165): 'Ich war kein Prophet.' Cf. too Am. iii. 7 f.: 'Surely the Lord God will do nothing, but he revealeth his secret unto his servants the prophets. The lion hath roared, who will not fear? The Lord God hath spoken, who can but prophesy?' where Amos would clearly seem to be referring to himself as numbered with the *nᵉbhî'îm*.

[109] By some the story is interpreted as pure allegory (Van Hoonacker, Les douzes petits prophètes, 1908; Toy, 'Note on Hosea 1–3,' in JBL, xxxii, 1913, pp. 75–79; Gressmann, SAT, II i, 1910; Regnier, 'Le réalisme dans les symboles des prophètes,' in RB, xxxii, 1923, pp. 383–408), and by others as historical (Cruveilhier, 'De l'interprétation historique des événements de la vie familiale du prophète Osée,' in RB, N. S. xiii, 1916, pp. 342–362; Schmidt, 'Die Ehe des Hosea,' in ZAW, N. F. i, 1924, pp. 245–272); by some chapter i is regarded as historical and chapter iii as allegorical (Volz,

and that Hosea, who loathed with all his soul the sacred fornication to which she was dedicated, felt an irresistible constraint to marry her, is right.[110] Modern psychologists may find terms for the particular sort of complex Hosea had.[111] But to him the constraint was of God, and that the experience became to him the medium of the word of God was the sufficient vindication of his belief.

Isaiah found his call in an overwhelming sense of the holy presence of God, crushing him with the consciousness of his own uncleanness, yet touching him into the consciousness of

---

'Die Ehegeschichte Hosea's,' in Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie, xii, 1898, pp. 321–335; Guthe, in Kautzsch-Bertholet, HSAT, 4th ed., ii, 1923; Humbert, 'Les trois premiers chapitres d'Osée,' in RHR, lxxvii, 1918, pp. 157–171), by some chapter iii is regarded as an account in the first person parallel to the account in the third person of chapter i (Gautier, Introduction à l'Ancien Testament, 1914 (reprinted 1939); Eissfeldt, Einleitung in das Alte Testament, 1934; T. H. Robinson, 'Die Ehe des Hosea,' in TSK, cvi, 1934–35, pp. 301–313, and in Prophecy and the Prophets, 1923, in Oesterley and Robinson's Introduction to the Books of the Old Testament, 1934, and in Robinson and Horst, Die zwölf kleinen Propheten (HAT, I xiv), 1938; Lindblom, Hosea literarisch untersucht, 1928), by some chapter iii is regarded as the sequel to chapter i, the woman of chapter iii being either Gomer (Bewer, The Literature of the Old Testament in its Historical Development, 1922; Budde, 'Der Abschnitt Hosea 1–3 und seine grundlegende religionsgeschichtliche Bedeutung,' in TSK, xcvi–xcvii, 1925, pp. 1–89; H. Wheeler Robinson, 'The Marriage of Hosea,' in Baptist Quarterly, N. S. v, 1930–31, pp. 304–313; Sellin, Einleitung in das Alte Testament, 7th ed., 1935), or another woman (Marti — who, however, holds chapter iii to be allegorical — Dodekapropheton (KHAT), 1904; Buzy, 'Les symboles d'Osée,' in RB, N. S. xiv, 1917, pp. 376–423 = Les symboles de l'Ancien Testament, 1923, chap ii; Smith-Irwin, The Prophets and their Times, 1941). Sellin (Introduction to the Old Testament, E. T. by Montgomery, 1923) and Budde (TSK, loc. cit.) hold that an original single autobiographical account has been divided into two and part thrown into the third person. Several writers have defended Gomer's reputation against the charge of adultery (Fück, 'Hosea Kapitel 3,' in ZAW, xxxix, 1921, pp. 283–290; Heermann, 'Ehe und Kinder des Propheten Hosea,' in ZAW, xl, 1922, pp. 287–312; Humbert, 'Osée, le prophète bédouin,' in RHPR, i, 1921, pp. 97–118; Batten, 'Hosea's Message and Marriage,' in JBL, xlviii, 1929, pp. 257–273; Sellin, Einleitung in das Alte Testament, 7th ed., 1935; Pfeiffer, Introduction to the Old Testament, 1941).

[110] So T. H. Robinson, Prophecy and the Prophets, 1923, and 'Die Ehe des Hosea,' in TSK, cvi, 1934–35, pp. 301–313; Schmidt, 'Die Ehe des Hosea,' in ZAW, N. F. i, 1924, pp. 245–272; Sellers, 'Hosea's Motives,' in AJSL, xli, 1924–25, pp. 243–247, May, 'The Names of Hosea's Children,' in JBL, lv, 1936, pp. 285–291; Smith-Irwin, The Prophets and their Times, 1941. For a psycho-analytical study of Hosea's attraction to that which he most loathed, cf. Allwohn, Die Ehe des Propheten Hosea, 1926.

[111] Sellers, loc. cit., describes Hosea as fundamentally a sensualist and a sadist, with a martyr complex, and an anti-food complex. This will satisfy whom it will.

a new purity. And when he heard the voice saying 'Whom shall I send?' he could not withhold his service, or refrain from consecrating to the divine word the lips that had been cleansed by the burning touch (Isa. vi).

Of all the prophets Jeremiah seems to have been the most conscious of the compelling character of his call. When it first came to him he tried to evade it on the grounds of his youth and inexperience, but the word of God was in his mouth, and it banished his fear (Jer. i. 4 ff.). Later, when he tried to escape from his vocation, and determined never again to utter the prophetic word, he found a fire burning in his very bones, and an inner constraint that he was powerless to control (Jer. xx. 9 ff.). When he describes the word of God as a fire and a hammer (Jer. xxiii. 29), all-consuming and all-shattering, against which a man is helpless, he is but describing it as he has known it in his own inner consciousness.

It is this sense of a divine vocation that is more profoundly characteristic of the higher prophecy than frenzy. And relevant to this is Jeremiah's complaint that his contemporaries were stealing one another's oracles (Jer. xxiii. 30), and uttering their own thoughts rather than the word of the Lord (xxiii. 16). Instead of knowing the direct constraint of the spirit of God, they were looking round for their oracles. They were the mere members of a profession, not men of vocation.

VII

That there was a large element of abnormality in the higher prophets does not seem to me to admit of question.[112] Sometimes it was doubtless quite indistinguishable from that of their rivals, who, at any rate superficially, and probably often actually, expressed in their various forms of 'ecstasy' earnestness as well as 'madness.' The higher prophets may have known ex-

[112] Causse would admit this, but declares it only an accident of prophecy. Cf. RHPR, ii, 1922, p. 354: 'Elle (i.e. ecstasy) est seulement au point de départ historique et elle s'est maintenue chez les grands prophètes comme une survivance à laquelle les contemporains et le prophète lui-même ont pu ajouter une importance plus ou moins grande, mais elle n'est plus qu'un phénomène accidental.' Cf. too Mowinckel, Acta Orientalia, xiii, 1935, pp. 271 f.: 'Manifestly there is an ecstatic element in all this. . . . All this, however, really represents unessentials.'

periences of a more refined and spiritual exaltation, which is better known by other names,[113] as not a few writers have claimed. Micklem interprets it in terms of poetic inspiration,[114] while others prefer to talk of mysticism.[115] No one of these categories will suffice to embrace the whole of the higher prophecy. For the whole should be interpreted neither in terms of its highest nor of its lowest levels. In our idealization of the prophets we should not forget that there were crudities even in the greatest of them. Gunkel observes that if we would understand the prophet Isaiah, we must never forget that he went about naked in the streets for three years.[116] Not infrequently the prophets did odd things. Jeremiah's marching about with a

[113] Cf. Mowinckel, JBL, liii, 1934, pp. 207 f.: 'On the whole little remains of the ecstatic element, apart from that which is the sound psychological substratum and core of religious ecstasy: the all-predominating, all-exclusive consciousness of having been called by Yahweh to deliver a religious and moral message. All external stimuli, such as dancing and music, have been abandoned. True the state in which they deliver that message is "elevated," but it is also characterized by spiritual clarity and reasoned judgment. Their utterances are given in a finished and artistic form; to the solemn words of judgment they generally add a clear, reasoned, moral and religious exposition; and their words do not come to them as a wild stammering glossolaly — as involuntary, unconscious words accompanied by unconscious reflex actions — but as moral and religious apprehensions of inexorable facts, apprehensions which "rise up" in them from the depths of the subconscious to attain lucidity, merging into their moral and religious personality.' Cf. Guillaume, Prophecy and Divination, pp. 292 f.

[114] Prophecy and Eschatology, chap. i. Barrois complains that Micklem's prophets 'might be the ancestors of a certain Protestantism.' He says: 'L'auteur va trop loin dans sa comparaison des prophètes avec nos lyriques modernes, et je crains qu'il ne réduise en fin de compte l'inspiration prophétique à une sorte d'inspiration poétique' (RB, xxxvi, 1927, p. 132). Cf. Hines, 'The Development of the Psychology of Prophecy,' in JR, viii, 1928, pp. 212–224. Cf. also Lods (Les prophètes, p. 64 =) The Prophets and the Rise of Judaism, p. 58: 'It is also quite likely that the great prophets thought they heard within themselves the "word of Jahweh," not only when they were really in ecstatic trance, but also when they were in a state of excitement analogous to what we call poetic or artistic inspiration, when words and images seem to crowd of their own accord into the mind and are apparently dictated to it.'

[115] Cf. Hines, 'The Prophet as Mystic,' in AJSL, xl, 1923–24, pp. 37–71; Lindblom, Die literarische Gattung der prophetischen Literatur, 1924, where the experiences of mediaeval mystics are cited for comparison. Heschel (Die Prophetie, pp. 40 ff., 165 ff.) differentiates the prophetic consciousness from both the poetic and the mystical. Cf. also Guillaume, Prophecy and Divination, p. 294.

[116] Cf. Die Propheten, 1917, p. 111: 'Männer, die so wunderliche Handlungen vornehmen, können auch nicht ruhig und besonnen gesprochen haben. Das also muss man sich bei der Erklärung der Worte, auch eines Jesaia immer wieder vor Augen halten: dieser Mann ist einmal drei Jahre lang nackend gegangen!' Sellers (AJSL, xli, 1924–25,

wooden yoke on his shoulders would strike us as childish, and the symbolic names given to Isaiah's and Hosea's children would seem a little hard on the children. But Wheeler Robinson rightly emphasizes that many of these things were potent symbols, not in the sense of illustrations of the prophet's message, but of prophetic messages in themselves.[117] The Hebrew did not distinguish between the word and the act so sharply as we do, and both could be prophetic. Moreover, both could release power. The prophet's word was never merely a forecast of the future. Like the curse and the blessing,[118] it possessed inherent power to work for its own fulfilment.[119] Just because it was the word of God it was alive and active. When it left the lips of the prophet, it was but launched on its career of activity, beyond the control of the prophet and beyond that of his enemies. And in the same way the prophetic acts of symbolism released divine power to effect the things symbolized.[120] Superficially this would seem to reduce them to mere

p. 245) says: 'Isaiah's going exposed about the streets of Jerusalem is a clear case of exhibitionism, a tendency which may be observed at any bathing-beach or track meet.' With this contrast Hertzberg, Prophet und Gott, 1923, p. 41: 'Hier ist die Unterordnung unter den Willen Jahves, das Sich-ganz-in-den-Dienststellen, auf die Spitze getrieben. Es könnte eine Absicht der Berichterstattung darin gefunden werden, dass Jesaja hier, — es ist das einzige Mal — von Jahve "mein Knecht" gennant wird. Der göttliche Wille füllt so sein Inneres, dass der Prophet nicht anders kann, als auch sein äusseres Handeln zum Ausdruck des in ihm Lebenden zu machen. Das Innere schlägt das Aussere in den Bann. Der Leib wird jetzt gleichsam Werkzeug des Geistes, wie der Geist in diesem Augenblicke Werkzeug der Gottheit ist.' In the discussion on the present paper, Mr. L. H. Brockington observed that in prophetic symbolism the prophet threw his whole self into his prophecy, and made not his lips alone, but his whole personality, the vehicle of the divine 'word.'

[117] 'Prophetic Symbolism,' in Old Testament Essays, 1927, pp. 1–17, and 'Hebrew Sacrifice and Prophetic Symbolism,' in JTS, xliii, 1942, pp. 129–139. Cf. Lofthouse, AJSL, xl, 1923–24, pp. 239 ff.; Buzy, Les symboles de l'Ancien Testament, 1923, and Regnier, 'Le réalisme dans les symboles des prophètes,' in RB, xxxii, 1923, pp. 383–408.

[118] Cf. Pedersen, Israel I–II, 1926, pp. 182–212, 411–452.

[119] Cf. Isa. xlv. 23, lv. 10 f.

[120] Cf. Lods (RHPR, ix, 1929, p. 173): 'Plusieurs des actes "symboliques" accomplis par les hommes de Dieu israélites ou attribués à tel d'entre eux, ont une affinité évidente avec les rites de magie imitative pratiqués chez les non-civilisés ou dans l'antiquité pour agir, non pas sur les esprits des assistants, mais *sur les événements* eux-mêmes, sur l'avenir; ces actes sont tenus pour "efficaces," non parce qu'ils sont "impressionants," mais dans un sens bien autrement réel, *parce qu'ils produisent eux-mêmes ce qu'ils figurent.*'

examples of magic, but again Wheeler Robinson has distinguished between prophetic symbolism and magic, in that magic is the attempt to control events by a technique which constrains the spiritual powers, whereas prophetic symbolism is the control of events through the technique by the God whose constraint is the source of the symbol.[121]

It has been said that some interpret prophecy in terms of mysticism, and the mystic's union with the deity. S. A. Cook denies the appositeness of this,[122] and Lofthouse declares that the divine call differentiates the prophet from the mystic.[123] But again mysticism is a wide term, covering experiences which in some of their reaches are not in any sense typical of the prophet. But that the prophet was conscious of a real union with God is not to be doubted. Hölscher drew attention to the prophet's conception of himself as an extension of the divine personality,[124] and Wheeler Robinson has suggested that the concept of corporate personality can explain in what sense the prophet thought of his union with God.[125] A similar view is taken by Johnson, who, in the course of a study of corporate personality as it appears in the conception of God, gathers much evidence from the Old Testament to show in how vital a sense the prophet regarded himself as the mouthpiece of God, and believed that he was not merely transmitting the message of God, but that in him God was speaking, since He had gathered the prophet's personality into His own.[126] This is something rather different from the mystic's absorption in God, from which

[121] Cf. Old Testament Essays, 1927, p. 14; Redemption and Revelation, 1942, p. 250; JTS, xliii, 1942, pp. 132 f. Cf. Brockington, in Studies in History and Revelation (ed. by Payne), 1942, p. 41: 'Because of his entire submission to the will of God his acts are fully taken up into the divine purpose and become part of the creative process.'

[122] The Old Testament: a Reinterpretation, pp. 188 f.

[123] AJSL, loc. cit., p. 237; cf. p. 242.

[124] Die Profeten, p. 25: 'Die Profeten reden nicht nur im Auftrage und nach dem Geheisse Jahwes, wiederholen nicht nur Worte und Offenbarungen, die der Gott ihnen zugeraunt oder in der Vision gezeigt hat, sondern sie reden als Gott selbst und identifizieren sich, solange sie ekstatisch sprechen, durchaus mit ihm.' Cf. Hertzberg, Prophet und Gott, 1923, p. 12: 'Das Bewusstsein, mit der Gottheit eins zu sein, gibt ihrer Stellung zur Gottheit das Gepräge.'

[125] ZAW, xli, 1923, pp. 9 f. = Redemption and Revelation, pp. 149 f.

[126] The One and the Many in the Israelite Conception of God, 1942, especially pp. 36 f.

Heschel also would differentiate it, while expressing it in other terms than in those of corporate personality. Heschel speaks of the prophet's sharing of the divine *pathos* in a sympathy whereby he enters into the very experience of God Himself,[127] and this Wheeler Robinson finds to be complementary to his own approach,[128] rather than essentially different from it.[129]

VIII

But if the prophet is an extension of the divine personality, he does not cease to be himself, and his message comes through the organ of his personality, and not by its suspension.[130] I have elsewhere used the figure of light passing through a piece of colored glass, where the light is wholly from without the glass, yet wholly modified by it. The prophets believed that they were charged with the word of God, yet that word was everywhere marked by the experience, outlook and personality of the prophet through whom it was given. Here there is little difference between the more extreme 'ecstatic' theorists and others. For the former, though finding the prophet's conscious personality suspended in the trance or fit through which he received the oracle, but go down to his unconscious self, which is yet more truly himself. Theodore Robinson says:[131] 'Since in abnormal psychological states it is a man's real nature and opinions that are expressed, it makes little or no difference whether and to what extent men like Hosea and Micah were ecstatic; in any case, they believed profoundly in the truth of what they said, and they were impelled to speak by their own intense convictions.' This might seem to suggest that prophetic 'ecstasy' was a mere lifting of all restraint, so that the prophet's real self appeared, instead of the imposing of a divine constraint. There are not wanting, indeed, those who would go to this

[127] Die Prophetie, pp. 127 ff.

[128] Redemption and Revelation, p. 150 n.

[129] Cf. Porteous, in Record and Revelation (ed. H. W. Robinson), p. 240.

[130] Cf. Brockington, loc. cit., p. 35: 'The word of God to the world was not independent of the personality of the men who heard it and uttered it.'

[131] In Oesterley and Robinson's Hebrew Religion, 2nd ed., 1937, p. 223. Cf. Prophecy and the Prophets, pp. 44 f. Cf. also Expository Times, xl, 1928–29, p. 298: 'The prophetic utterances were based directly on the prophet's knowledge of God and man.'

extreme, and who would trace the prophet's inspiration to nothing deeper than himself. Thus Ackerman regards the prophetic consciousness as a piece of self-deception.[132] He traces the source of his utterance wholly to the prophet himself, and in particular to his interest and meditation. Elijah's still, small voice, he says, was 'clearly the result of original meditation.'[133] Or again, 'The manner in which Jeremiah expresses his inspiration is illustrative of the general prophetic habit to sublimate the facts of their inspiration. This deliberate subtilization of inspirational power . . . tends to cover up the commonplace nature of inspiration, or at any rate, to conceal the prophet's own psychological ignorance of the source of his prophetic calling.'[134] That Theodore Robinson would not subscribe to so shallow a view, however, is clear, for he elsewhere declares that the 'ecstatic' theory 'insists that the real point at which the self-revealing divine impinges on the human soul is to be found in those deeper ranges of spiritual life which lie far below the level of normal consciousness.'[135] He therefore recognizes that if the prophet's inspiration comes through his sub-conscious self, it does not come wholly from it, and that his personality is so profoundly the organ of the inspiration that the content of his message accords with his intense convictions. His conscious, as well as his sub-conscious self would thus appear to be in his utterance, and the source of his inspiration is not traced wholly to himself, nor so wholly to the not-self that he ceases to be more than the passive medium of his message. Here again we have passed to something much more fundamental than the extent of 'ecstasy' in the prophetic psychology. That the prophets were real men, with real interests, and minds that functioned, is not to be denied. But that their message came merely from themselves, and was authenticated by an experience precisely similar to that whose authenticating value they denied in others could not carry us far. Nor could it offer any solution of the problem of prophecy profound enough to account for its phenomena.

[132] 'The Nature of Hebrew Prophecy,' in Anglican Theological Review, iv, 1921–22, pp. 97–127. [133] Ibid., p. 103. [134] Ibid., p. 102.
[135] Expository Times, xlviii, 1936–37, p. 182.

IX

We must distinguish between the occasion, or the medium, of inspiration and its source. Sometimes a chance sight or sound, arising from some ordinary experience, suggested a message.[136] When Amos saw a basket of summer fruit, his thought travelled from the word *summer* (*kaiṣ*) to the word *end* (*kēṣ*), and thence to the consummation to which the life of Israel was hastening (Am. viii. 1 ff.). When Jeremiah saw an almond tree in blossom, his mind similarly moved from *almond tree* (*shaḳedh*) to *waking* (*shōḳēdh*), and he reflected on the awakening activity of God in the affairs of men (Jer. i. 11 f.). A seething pot set over a rough fireplace, fed and blown from the northern side, similarly turned his thoughts to the situation of the hour (Jer. i. 14 ff.). On another occasion the sight of two baskets of figs of widely contrasted quality set him thinking on the men who had gone into exile and those who had taken their place in the control of the state (Jer. xxiv. 1 ff.); and on yet another occasion a potter at this wheel set his mind working (Jer. xviii. 1 ff.). On all such occasion the prophets believed that their minds sprang to the fundamentally unrelated message because God controlled it. There was nothing in the thing seen of itself to dictate the contents of the message. The modern interpreter may trace it no farther than to the prophet's own mind, or to his unconscious self. But the prophet believed that it was in a flash of divine illumination that he perceived what God was saying to him through the experience. Guillaume has collected from Arabic sources a number of parallels, recording accounts of diviners who found their message mediated to them through some simple thing on which their eye happened to alight.[137] In the case of the prophets, however, there is a greater spontaneity, in that it was not when applied to for a message that they looked round for some timely omen, but that the sight appears to have prompted the message, either

[136] Theodore Robinson agrees that these were ordinary experiences of real objects, but supposes that the prophets stared hard at them until their whirling brain perceived more than others could detect (Expositor, 8th series, xxi, 1921, pp. 226 f.). I do not think there is adequate evidence for this supposition.

[137] Cf. Prophecy and Divination, pp. 118 ff., 142 ff.

à propos of nothing in particular, or perhaps because it happened to fit in with their train of thought.[138]

Sometimes the message was mediated not through a momentary experience, but through a prolonged one, whose significance may not at once have become clear to the prophet. Thus Hosea's experience of his wife's unfaithfulness brought him first agony before it led him to a deeper understanding of the love of God. Nor did he trace his message no farther than to his suffering when he found it. He traced it to God. There is nothing in that experience of suffering itself to proclaim the love of God to man. Similarly Jeremiah through his deep loneliness found the inner quality of true religion, and just because he was cut off from the observances of the cultus, yet was conscious of God's presence, found religion to be something more profound than the cultus. Yet again he would have repudiated the thought that he had merely meditated on the meaning of his experience. For the experience itself had not this meaning. It was what God was saying to him through the experience, and seeking through him to say to men. For he was the mouthpiece of God, not himself the object of God's message so much as the extension of the divine personality, through whom the message was given to men.

In all this we are therefore brought back to God as the fundamental authenticator of prophecy. It was not because the prophets were 'ecstatic' that they knew their message to be true, and not because they were less 'ecstatic' than others that they differentiated their message as true from that which they held to be false. It was because God was so overpoweringly real to them,[139] constraining them irresistibly to deliver a message that often racked their very soul, or speaking to them through an

[138] Cf. Brockington (loc. cit., p. 36): 'The process may probably be explained as one of association: a chance presentation of an object to the eye, or of a sound to the ear or any other sense perception, elicits and makes fully articulate what has been already half-formed or partially realized, just as memory long dormant can be awakened in the same way.'

[139] Cf. Skinner, Prophecy and Religion, pp. 195 f.: 'This immediate consciousness of having the mind of God is the ultimate secret of true prophetic inspiration, which, being incommunicable, can neither be analysed nor applied as an objective criterion of an alleged revelation. . . . He who has it knows that he has it, though he who lacks it may be deceived in thinking he has it.'

experience of deepest agony, that they knew they had the word of God. Others might claim to be speaking in the name of God a message in direct disagreement with their own, and to the eye of the observer there might be little to mark the one as authentic and the other as false. But the prophets were sure that that other message was mediated through a shallow experience of God, or born of insincerity of spirit, just because they were so sure of their own experience. By its very nature that was not a certainty that could be communicated to others in any undeniable manner. For it was a religious certainty.[140] And religion must ever be something more than an intellectually or scientifically demonstrable proposition.

In this connection the story of 1 Kings xiii is instructive. The prophet who came from Judah to Bethel delivered his prophecy and set out to return to Judah, in obedience to the word of the Lord that came to him, saying 'Thou shalt eat no bread and drink no water there, nor turn again to go by the way that thou camest.' Later the old prophet of Bethel went after him and lied to him, alleging a prophetic message cancelling the one on which the other relied. Later in the story the lying prophet becomes the medium of an authentic message to the other, which was duly fulfilled, — a message, singularly enough, rebuking him for listening to the bogus message. Clearly there was nothing superficial to distinguish the true message from the false, and so far as the reversal of a prophetic message is concerned, other cases are recorded where both are regarded as genuine. Yet here there is less condemnation for the lying prophet than for his victim, whose fault was just that he allowed a communication received through another, whose authenticity in the nature of the case could never be as certain as the authenticity of his own direct message, to override the

[140] Cf. H. Wheeler Robinson, Redemption and Revelation, p. 90: 'If we go on to say that in this and through this consciousness, by some leap of "sympathetic" faith on the prophet's part, God was enabled in fulfilment of His purpose to enter human history, then the statement constitutes a leap of faith akin to that made by the prophet himself. We can never eliminate that personal factor, in regard to either the outer or inner event'; cf. p. 139: 'In the last resort, we shall know as much or as little of the prophetic consciousness as is the degree to which we share its essential and central experience.'

latter.) That lying prophecies should mislead the general public, who had no infallible means of testing them, is not surprising, and the prophets therefore denounce in the strongest terms the iniquity of the lying prophets. But for the prophet who, in his own inner consciousness, has known the certainty of the divine word to defer to a word received through any other, incompatible with it, is disobedience. He is substituting what may be of man for what he is sure was of God.

X

It will be observed that I have said nothing of prediction, and nothing of the common view to-day that true prophecy was essentially prophecy of woe, *Unheilsprophetie*.[141] So far as the latter is concerned I do not share the view that woe was of the essence of true prophecy, and that the prophets of weal who opposed the greater prophets stand exposed as false by that fact. It is true that the greater prophets were usually prophets of woe.[142] But Isaiah was just as truly a prophet when he promised deliverance to Jerusalem as when he opposed the anti-Assyrian policy.[143] Nor do I share the view which has long been all too common that prediction is not a mark of prophecy.[144] The common modern antithesis between *foretelling* and *forthtelling* would have had little meaning in ancient Israel.[145] For the prophets were continually predicting the fu-

[141] Cf. Baentsch, Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie, l, 1908, p. 464; Gressmann, Der Messias, 1929, pp. 77 ff.; Gunkel, in RGG, 2nd ed., iv, 1930, cols. 1543 f.; Weinrich, op. cit., pp. 24 ff.; Mowinckel, JBL, loc. cit., p. 219.

[142] Cf. Jer. xxviii. 8 f.

[143] Cf. Jepsen, Nabi, p. 252, where, in the closing words of his book the author summarizes prophecy as 'Zeugnis von Gott, seinem Gesetz, seiner Verheissung, seinem Handeln in der Geschichte in Gericht und Gnade.' Both *Gericht* and *Gnade* belong to true prophecy.

[144] Cf. Ackerman, Anglican Theological Review, iv, 1921–22, p. 116: 'Prophecy was certainly predictive'; Gunkel, Expositor, 9th series, i, 1924, p. 433 (= SAT II ii, 1923, p. xxvi): 'There is none among the literary prophets whose first word was not an announcement of a future event'; Guillaume, op. cit., p. 111: 'There is no prophet in the Old Testament who was not a foreteller of the future.'

[145] Cf., e.g., Charles, Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel, 1929, p. xxvi: 'Prophecy is a declaration, a forthtelling, of the will of God — not a foretelling. Prediction is not in any sense an essential element of prophecy, though it may intervene as an accident — whether it be a justifiable accident is another question.'

ture, though commonly the future as arising out of the present rather than a distant and unrelated future; and deutero-Isaiah appeals to fulfilled prediction as the vindication of prophecy[146] no less confidently than Deuteronomy lays down the fulfilment or non-fulfilment of prophecy as the test of its genuineness.[147]

But it was not mere prediction as a brilliant forecast of the future, whether near or distant, that gave to prophecy its deepest content. For Old Testament prophecy is a fundamentally spiritual phenomenon. The prophet's message always bore the mark of the personality of the man through whom it came. But he was always sure it bore the mark of something profounder than his personality, because he was so sure of the One from Whom it came. That it was imperfect and fallible is not surprising, since it was mediated through imperfect and fallible men. Yet it mediated some light from Him Who is perfect and infallible. For the prophet's message was ever related to his view of God. Through the immediacy of his inner experience of God he perceived the meaning of the events of his own life and of the contemporary affairs of men, and he saw all in the illuminating light of what he had seen of God. As Mowinckel has observed,[148] the word that came to the prophets must accord with what they had known of Yahweh, and by this they were able to test the message that came to them. The prophet's real criterion was therefore not whether he had received the message in some 'ecstatic' way, but whether it harmonized with the character of the God he had known.[149] A

[146] Cf. Isa. xlv. 21, xlvi. 9 f.

[147] Dt. xviii. 22. That this simple test is not alone adequate is recognized in Dt. xiii. 1 ff., but that it should be mentioned at all as a test of prophecy shows beyond a peradventure that prophecy was regarded as dealing essentially in prediction.

[148] JBL, liii, 1934, p. 211.

[149] Cf. Mowinckel, Acta Orientalia, loc. cit., pp. 279 f.: 'The content is the deciding factor, which makes the prophets' experience an experience of God. The experience of an empty and more or less unutterable *mysterium tremendum et fascinosum* would not make the prophets essentially different from the common nabhi'; the ecstatic nebhi'-im had purely "numinous" experiences, but these were of no value as revelations. What is merely "numinous" may just as well be "Ba'al" as Yahweh; it may just as well be a "lying spirit" as the spirit of Yahweh, and of this the great prophets are fully aware. The content of an experience makes it an experience of Yahweh, or rather, proves that it is one. In other words, *the certitude of the experience depends upon whether*

mere welling up of words from his own heart might be but false prophecy. It was therefore necessary to test it by its content.[150] This means, says Mowinckel, that the prophets' minds were at work, not only in the depths of the unconscious, but in their conscious thought as well.[151]

To say this, of course, is not to revert to the view that the prophet's message has no deeper source than his own heart, and that it was mere self-deception to attribute it to God. It is rather to say that the man who had known God in the immediacy of his own experience, and who under the constraint of that experience addressed himself to the needs of the world which he saw in the light of his knowledge of God, spoke a word which was at once his own and not his own.

That this was true in some measure of the false prophets I see no reason to doubt. For the difference between the true and the false prophets was no clear cut distinction that contemporaries or successors could easily discern. It was at bottom a difference in the experience of God and in the understanding of His nature and will. With a shallower experience of God the false prophets were less concerned with the sinfulness and unrighteousness of the nation. Because they had not realized that it was an offence to God it was no offence to them. Men who had not known Amos's burning sense of the righteousness of God could not know his horror at the injustice that prevailed; men who had not shared Hosea's perception of the love of God could not share his realization of the demand of that love for the undivided love and loyalty of men in response. Therefore they could not be expected to utter predictions which sprang out of that horror or that realization, or to utter a word of Yahweh summoning men to righteousness and love.

While, therefore, true and false prophets both provided evi-

---

it has a definite content, capable of being apprehended by the mind and tested by religious and moral standards.' Cf. JBL, loc. cit., p. 217; also Skinner, Prophecy and Religion, p. 195.

[150] Cf. Mowinckel, Acta Orientalia, loc. cit., p. 286: 'The great prophets know perfectly well that "words" can come to them which are nothing but "visions of their own hearts." Accordingly they lay down certain criteria of *the true word of Yahweh*. . . . The *content* of the word will afford a more reliable test.'

[151] Acta Orientalia, loc. cit., p. 289.

dence of abnormal psychology, and both forecast the future, the nature of prophecy is not to be defined in terms of these things. What is really vital is the relation of the prophet and of his word to God. The prophet who is properly so called was a man who knew God in the immediacy of experience, who felt an inescapable constraint to utter what he was profoundly convinced was the word of God, and whose word was at bottom a revelation of the nature of God no less than of His will, who saw the life of men in the light of his vision of God, and who saw the inevitable issue of that life, who therefore declared that issue and pleaded with men to avoid it by the cleansing and renewing of their lives.[152] He was a true prophet in the measure of his experience of God, and the measure of his experience was the measure of his receptiveness and of his response to it.

[152] Cf. Albright, From the Stone Age to Christianity, p. 232: 'The prophet was a man who felt himself called by God for a special mission, in which his will was subordinated to the will of God, which was communicated to him by direct inspiration. The prophet was thus a charismatic spiritual leader, directly commissioned by Yahweh to warn people of the perils of sin and to preach reform and revival of true religion and morality.'

THE ATONING WORK OF CHRIST IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

MORTON S. ENSLIN
Crozer Theological Seminary

From his earliest days on this planet man has ever been conscious that he has been walking on dangerous ground; that he is far from being lord of all he surveys; that instead there are powers, apparently quite outside of himself or of his control, of which he need definitely be on his guard. Under certain circumstances they will work for him, aid him, make his life more secure; under others, they can and do bring about just the reverse. With the dawn of conscience, which latter in essence may be called the memory of burnt fingers and rapped knuckles, he became convinced that certain courses of action definitely did not pay; others did. Together with other forms of magic he speedily discovered — or thought that he did — that it paid very decidedly to give to these invisible but dreadfully real powers what they wanted. Thus he might very possibly escape their vengeance, might even gain their favor. *Do ut des*, perhaps even more frequently *do ne des*, became one of the earliest utterances of what anthropologists with marked charity have denominated *homo sapiens*. It would appear to me too obvious and well attested to require detailed proof that sacrifice was man's attempt to placate, avert the anger, satisfy, make friendly to him, powers which he might or might not know, but toward which he had come to have, by the only way in which he has ever learned anything, viz., experience, a very lively respect. As it was in the beginning, is now, and apparently ever will be. It matters little what terms we use: it may be *atonement*, which, as has been so frequently pointed out, is simply at-one-ment; *reconciliation*; *salvation* — all are in essence the consequence of man's attempt to establish his feet upon what are at best slippery places. The initiative comes from man; the motive is to better himself; the underlying

cause, however he may seek to disguise it from himself and his fellows, powers which he fears and wishes to placate.

Eventually the notion is sure to arise — it is one of the consequences of the doubtful blessing of civilization that we speedily learn how to hear sonorous echoes of our own voices coming back from the distant and sometimes invisible cliffs of life — that "God had said it," "God had laid down the law," that we were but obeying an eternal divinely ordained plan, divinely communicated to us. But despite the categorical insistence of the priests and the plausible explanations of the theologians, neither of whom has ever seemed to experience any especial difficulty in hearing and interpreting the voice of God, the historian has the uncomfortable feeling, as he reads the pages of the past, that most of the things which God has been charged with "saying" and "devising" he has *said* through human mouths and *devised* through human brains. Thus beneath the whole somewhat giddy superstructure of what is piously and modestly styled the "divine plan of salvation," with its developing complexity as to the precise way in which God had designed (or deigned) to save man from the just consequences of his wicked and deliberate disobedience, one foundation stone, and only one, is to be seen: man's effort to secure himself from ills.

Judaism (and it may be added parenthetically that the same was true for her lawful child, Christianity) took itself seriously as a revealed religion. All that man was to do or think God had anticipated and made known in his all-embracing law. In consequence of this the earlier basic, and if I may use the other adjective, "logical," element in sacrifice is utterly lost, for it is no longer man's spontaneous effort in his own behalf; instead it has become God's arrangement and its form is no longer open to question: "Do it thus and so, not because it appears to you natural or sensible or appeals to anything within you, moral or otherwise, but because God says so." Cain's offering is not acceptable, Abel's is, not because Cain was a bad man and Abel a good man, but because Jehovah had ordained that fruits of the ground were not acceptable to him, firstlings of the flock with the fat thereof were. Judaism needed

no theory — and never had one — of *how* sacrifice or other rites expiated sin. Such was utterly out of place and unthinkable in a revealed religion. God, not man, had set the terms, had indicated the how. Man must obey. Any refusal to perform the task because man did not see values in it or because he thought he could do it more expeditiously was in itself a greater sin than the original offense.

Eventually trouble was in store. Someone was bound to ask *why* God wants it so. This was no problem for Judaism. For the ritualists, the priests and their retainers, God *did* want it, and that was that; for the rebels — the Amoses, the Micahs, and the Jeremiahs — God *did not* want it, had never commanded it at all; the whole wretched system was man's folly and of man's devising. Of course, it is not for an instant to be thought that these uncomfortable men, however much they thought they were getting back to the good old days, did get back. For them, as much as for the most insistent of the priests, the true method was wholly of God's devising. He had revealed it to men, and in the good old days they had seen and followed, until this wretched farce of temples and altars, streaming blood and steaming fat, had been foisted upon him.

But later, as Christianity, the legitimate but soon disowned child of Judaism, came to take its place in the outside world, came to attract men of speculative minds — a phenomenon orthodox Judaism rarely had to contend with — the problem of the *why* God so wanted it was raised, and insistently. But it was utterly impossible to get back to an honest recognition that it had been due to man's natural desire to placate a naturally wrathful or at least an easily angered God — a view which very probably had been shared in by the early, i.e., pre-Jewish, Hebrews — to bring him into line. This was just the angle that could not be recognized; for during the years God had grown — at least he had been changed. Though it was he, not man, who had devised the whole arrangement, he had become too high, too good, to need it or desire it. He had devised it for man's sake. Thus the reconciliation, atonement, must be seen as initiated by God for the purpose of reconciling,

making at one with himself, man; and the stubborn fact that the whole scenario — original plot and subsequent development — was and has always been man's creation became, and has largely so remained, hidden to the theologians. And to the historian, as he views this particularly amazing attempt through the years to turn on their heads stubborn historical facts, to substitute that which is acted upon for that which acts, there comes at times the disquieting suspicion that he will never, can never, feel at home with his theological colleagues until they pay a bit more attention to what seem to him stubborn facts; until they quit depriving man of his richest, if not his only, privilege of groping and floundering as he strives to reach outside himself, by stealing his show and depriving him of his right to try to save himself by saving him — or trying to — against his will.

Although, as has been suggested, much in the later theory of how the reconciliation of God and man was achieved, of how the suffering and death of Jesus were important in producing or making possible the desired atonement, is definitely outside the Jewish tradition and was achieved after the church had been divided from the synagogue, it is nonetheless true that there is a distinctive and definitely Jewish element underlying it, without which the later development would have been very different. This is particularly true in regard to the view of the nature of sin — an element destined to play a large part in subsequent Christian thinking.

As has been already remarked, Judaism had long come to regard itself as definitely a religion of revelation. Failure to recognize this cardinal fact has led to all sorts of mistaken notions about the burden of the law under which Israel is supposed to have staggered. This revelation was believed to have been complete and entire. Every problem of life that could ever arise had been anticipated by God and included in his revelation to the fathers through Moses. Moral conduct, the way men were to worship, even their attitudes of mind and will — these had been present in the mind of God before the law had been promulgated; and in the law they were to be

found, not always explicitly, to be sure, yet included and man's for the searching.

Since this was the case, sin for the Jew was no indifferent or casual matter. For him, it was not, as it so often was for his gentile brother, an error of judgment, a missing of the mark; instead it was a deliberate and wanton act of unfilial defiance. At this point another distinctive element of Jewish thinking is to be seen. Whatever may have been true of Jehovah's attitude to Israel in the early days, for Judaism he had come to be regarded as the divine Father of the Jewish people; and love and concern for mankind, more especially for the Jew, were conspicuous among his qualities. Thus, as I have said, sin was regarded as an unfilial act of defiance to a loving and gracious father, a deliberate act of rebellion to God. The father said to his son, "Son, go work today in the vineyard;" the son replied, "I will not."

All this was alien to the Greek. He must avoid the grave offenses, or else; he must not run afoul of the *amour propre* of the gods. Since, however, he laid little emphasis on either the notion of the divine love for man or of personal holiness, there was in consequence no feeling that sin was an act of rejection of the loving care of the gods or a fall from the kind of life they wanted man to live since they themselves manifested it. Rather it was a wrong against the divine power which governs the world. It was *hubris* (ὕβρις), wanton insolence, as in the rash act of Pentheus or in Laius' disregard of Apollo's warning that he should not marry or have a son. On the whole, though it would be rash to make an obvious contrast too absolute, sacrifice for the Greek was to ask and acknowledge blessings rather than to expiate sins. At times a sense of sin or guilt and the need of piacular sacrifice are to be found in Homer; yet on the whole a genial relationship exists. The gods sit invisible at the good man's table, and enjoy the jocund feast.

From the point of view of Judaism there was only one real remedy for sin, viz., repentance. The disobedient son must repent, must about-face, must go to work in the vineyard. The prodigal must return from the far country; the faithless wife must return to her husband; the repentant Zacchæus must

restore fourfold. Other elements might be present and in certain circles might bulk large — burnt offerings, sin offerings, the annual ceremony of the scapegoat — without repentance they were worse than useless. The essential element was the confession of guilt and the plea for pardon, expressed by actual reformation of conduct as well as by word of mouth: "Cease to do evil; learn to do well."

Christianity has often failed to recognize the centrality of that note in Judaism. The failure of Paul to stress it in his treatment of Israel's attitude to the law has done no little to raise barriers between the synagogue and the church. Before the world was created, before the law had been promulgated, while it was still only in the mind of God, coëval with it was the idea of repentance in the mind of God. Well did he know man's weakness; he knew that feet would slip: "He knoweth our frame, he remembereth that we are dust."

Of course in a religion that took itself seriously as possessing a complete revelation, or to phrase it differently, which believed that every practice of life had been ordained of God, sacrifice which was an inheritance of the past, however distasteful it might be to this prophet or that, was an integral part. Of course it was to be performed; God had ordained it. Interpreters of the law were not to narrow its scope, were not to raise captious questions as to its efficacy or why the lawgiver had so ordained it. Yet, and this is the important note, often overlooked, vain reliance upon it was folly. Without being accompanied by a true and genuine repentance it was useless. Thus the later rabbis saw in the "fools' sacrifice" of Eccl. 5: 1 the act of those who sin and offer sacrifices but fail to secure their forgiveness because they have failed to repent.[1] Without a genuine repentance (and all that it involves) no rite is efficacious. The origin of the ceremony of the scapegoat may well be obscure; as practiced by later Judaism it too makes very clear the central place that repentance plays. The sanctuary might still be anointed with blood; the animal was still driven forth. But that the desired effect was not attained by the physical disinfection of the temples or the physical bearing away of the sins — how-

[1] Cf. Berachot 23a.

ever efficacious those acts may once have been believed to have been — is clear from the nature of the confession of the people said over the animal by the high priest:

> O God, thy people, the House of Israel, have committed iniquity, transgressed, and sinned before thee. O God, forgive, I pray, the iniquities and transgressions and sins which thy people, the House of Israel, have committed and transgressed and sinned before thee; as it is written in the law of thy servant, Moses, "For on that day shall atonement be made for you to cleanse you; from all your sins shall ye be clean before the Lord." [2]

The desired restitution, reconciliation, atonement, was achieved solely by the forgiveness of God.

Here we have a real insight into the reason why as the years went by the mechanics of sacrifice declined in actual importance in the life of Israel. By the ancient reform which had limited the sacrifice to Jerusalem, only a small percentage of Jews could have any part in it. And more and more in the representative thinking of the nation the temple — preserver of the ancient customs, still jealously guarded by the priests and their devotees, flocked to by pilgrims — ceased to be the real centre of Jewish life. It remained a glamorous symbol, a visible proof of the nearness of Jehovah; to it thousands of pilgrims surged each feast day, anxious to assemble at least once in their lifetime to "Zion whither the tribes go up." But the uncompromising ethical demand, the insistence that without a deep and genuine repentance a man's sacrifice was more than useless — this had sounded the death knell of the temple as the actual centre of Jewish life. All this is seen very clear in the fact that Judaism took the fall of the temple in A.D. 70, and the complete cessation of sacrificial expiations which this involved, in its stride. The loss was keenly felt. But the temper of Judaism is well revealed in the story of the conversation between Johanan ben Zakkai and his disciple, Joshua ben Hananiah. As they passed the temple in ruins, the younger man exclaimed in sorrow: "Woe to us, for the place where the iniquities of Israel were atoned for is destroyed." And his master replied, "Do not grieve, my son, for we have an atonement which is just as good, namely, deeds of mercy, as the Scripture

[2] M. Yoma 6, 2.

says, For I desire mercy and not sacrifice." The story is late, but the insight is not. From the days of Amos and Hosea that note had been sounded, and not without avail. Jeremiah had given it his unforgettable support. Again and again the same refrain had been sounded in the Psalms. We hate to see temples and cathedrals fall prey to the incendiary torch or bomb. Sometimes their destruction is a veritable blessing for those who have eyes to see.

When we turn from Judaism to the first beginnings of the Christian gospel we feel very little change, and that should cause no surprise: there was no change in these fundamental insights. Eventually the person of Jesus came to be regarded not only as important but actually central in this matter of man's status with God: his incarnation, his suffering, his death became the hotly debated elements of a stupendous pyramid — that solidest of all structures when set upon its base — balanced upon its apex supported by the guy ropes of the most amazing theology.

As the actual rite of circumcision led to such a phrase as *circumcision of heart*, so the actual earlier ritual of piacular sacrifice made natural such terms as *redemption*, *propitiation*, and the like. If, as is apparently the case, the crucifixion took place at the time of the Passover, it is not surprising that as the years went by phraseology connected with that feast became prominent in the language of Christians. From "on the passover" to "Christ our passover" was an easy step. And to at least one early Christian it seemed highly fitting that as the paschal lambs were being slain in preparation for the coming feast the true paschal lamb, God's lamb, was slain too. Nor is it perhaps utterly fantastic to ponder whether the ancient story of the slaying of the first-born by the angel of death may not have contributed to the eventual notion of the death of God's first-born.

That there is the slightest support for this subsequent speculation in the thought or message of Jesus of Nazareth appears to me utterly improbable. That occasional elements have been read back into the gospel story — notably the phrase λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν (ransom for many) which was to play so significant,

and to me so dreadful, a part in later thought — is obvious, although they are far fewer and less central than is apparently commonly recognized. But that they reflect in the slightest degree Jesus' own outlook or even that of his early disciples I seriously question.

To me the evidence appears clear that Jesus regarded himself, and was regarded by those who heard him, as a prophet of God, calling the nation to repentance and preparation for the dawn of a new age, momentarily to appear. At any moment the heavenly messenger, the one he styled in good apocalyptic fashion the "son of man," would appear, to baptize the nation with a baptism of fire, to set up the final judgment and to preside over it. Nor was this a message of woe and warning as had been the dread threat of the earlier prophets as they taunted the nations with the prospect of the coming of the day of the Lord. The passing years had brought changes. Israel had gone through deep waters. One catastrophe after another had afflicted the little nation and had tried its confidence that it was the especial object of concern to the God of the whole world. Only by the ultrapractical theory of chastisement — whom the Lord loveth he chasteneth, and scourgeth every son whom he receiveth — had Israel been able to keep its confidence, a confidence apparently shared by her great son, Jesus. Jewish hopes for the future had been greatly changed during the centuries immediately prior to the dawn of Christianity. Many who would have scorned the notion of accepting heathen views had done precisely that without knowing it. From wells digged by no Jewish hands or shovels many heady draughts had been drunk, and, to change the figure, with the utter inability to recognize an economy of evolution or change which always characterizes a religion which seriously regards itself as revealed, these new views had become safely incorporated and vested with Scriptural authority. Thus apocalyptic speculation, although frowned upon by the learned, had become an important element in contemporary Jewish thinking and had apparently come to hold a dominating place in the thinking of some, notable among whom was Jesus of Nazareth.

How he had reached his confidence that the end was at hand,

that the long-expected new age was momentarily to dawn, and that he had been chosen of God to announce it, endowed with the spirit of prophecy to announce God's proposed gift — the greatest boon of life — to men, we do not know. Easy explanations have been often vouchsafed: God told him; with God he had planned this from eternity. Such explanations may be searchlights to the theologian; to the historian the scene still remains quite dark. That the confidence was his, that like an Ezekiel he too was convinced that God had charged him to call the nation to repentance, that he expected them to hearken with joy to the proffer of God's superlative gift, the pearl of price besides which all else paled into nothingness — all this appears to me abundantly clear. Of course they would hearken — it was all so clear to him. But they didn't. Like many before and after, he learned the universal lesson that straight is the gate and narrow the path. Nonetheless he knew he was right; one can't be a prophet if he is to have qualms. Whether the nation would see it or not, the kingdom was actually in their very midst, its shadow was even then on the land. Some were hearkening and starting the kind of life they would continue to live after its dawning; they were an earnest of those to come. The seed had been sown. It was God's seed, not man's; it was growing, albeit secretly; nothing man could do would thwart it. The harvest must come.

Finally he went to the nation's capital. Why we do not know. Again explanations have been common, but they are unconvincing. That he foresaw his death and predicted it openly three times to his disciples was the later view. But that actually he did this appears to me quite unlikely. Rather, it seems to come from the later time when reflection had set in, when men had become convinced that since it had happened it must have been foreseen and planned and that he, Jesus, now rising higher and higher on his dizzy ascent to Godhead, had foreseen and predicted it. But the eyes of his disciples were still holden; like the man in the story, they could see but dimly — men as trees walking — not till the light of the resurrection did they finally come to see what was so plain. But all this was later. He turned to the south. Perhaps the increasing op-

position had convinced him that his earlier dreams for the nation were not to be realized, that like the prophets before him he too would fall before the blind prejudice of those to whom he had been sent. But if he were to die, he must stand in Jerusalem and herald God's word in Zion. A prophet might not die save in Jerusalem. But all this is at best uncertain. We shall never know. It is far better not to seek to give a fictitious clarity to what is veiled in the impenetrable mists of time. Whatever the notions that led him from the hillsides of Galilee to the nation's capital, it is scarcely reckless to believe that he was confident that though he could not see the end from the beginning, God was directing his steps. God's will could not be thwarted; while it was day, he would do the will of him that sent him.

After a short time — how long we do not know despite the exactness of ecclesiastical Holy-Week calendars — the body of the prophet of Nazareth was silhouetted against the Judean hills, hanging on a Roman cross. With his death on the cross he can no longer protect himself; he belongs to the ages. Men can make of him what they will.

It has often been said that in the years following his death his followers were so concerned in trying to explain who he was, why he had exerted the grip upon them that he had, that they quite forgot to practice what he had enjoined. This is very true, but it is not the whole truth. If we can trust at all the tenor of the preaching in the early pages of Acts, his earliest followers continued where he left off — to proclaim the message which he had sounded and which they had understood perfectly: the speedy advent of the expected kingdom. But there was a significant change, and one indicative of more to follow. Released from the restraint of the prophet himself, who had directed and dominated the mission, yet ever mindful of him, they appear speedily to have made one notable alteration in his message. He had spoken constantly of the advent of the Son of man, destined as Final Judge to baptize the nations with a baptism of fiery judgment. That he had meant by that enigmatic phrase himself they seem to have become speedily convinced. As I have tried elsewhere to show, this significant

change was destined to give a motive power to the new move ment and to prevent it from vanishing as so many new gospel have vanished during man's sojourn on this little planet.

But the important point to be observed is that precisely thi became the central note in their preaching: the end of th world was at hand and the agent of this impending change wa none other than their crucified leader, Jesus of Nazareth, no in heaven but destined speedily to return to set up and presid over the Judgment. It was not the note that his death on th cross was invested with any special potency, that it was, t use the later phrase, "a ransom for many," that in him Go "was reconciling the world to himself," that as the eternal hig priest he had offered once and for all his own precious blood, sacrifice that needed not to be repeated. All that was sti beyond the far horizons. The emphasis in Acts is explicit: hi death was simply a horrid crime, one more act of infamy b those who had always opposed the truth — as your father killed the prophets, so do ye.

And it may be remarked, that this was the great obstacle t the spread of the gospel, despite the later rosy reports of thre thousand converts in less than six weeks. That a crucified felo was approved by God, had done God's will, and was destine to judge God's people was with a vengeance to the Jews stumblingblock just as it was destined later to seem to th Greeks foolishness. But apparently the early followers ha nothing better to offer. This in itself should give pause to thos convinced that the whole plan of salvation was implicit, if no actually explicit, in the preaching of Jesus.

Eventually a change came. A rabid Jew named Saul cam into the picture. What led to his conversion we do not know As he looked back over the years, he was convinced that i was in keeping with God's purpose, who had chosen him fro his mother's womb, but had not divulged the secret to Pau until the time for his service had come. Much has been rea into the story of this conversion, and then, after it has bee read in, it has been read out and established as incontroverti ble. We are left free to infer what we please; but we should b very cautious against using inferences as building stones. Ap

arently Paul became convinced — how we do not know — that esus far from being accursed of God (as the stubborn fact of is crucifixion had seemed to make certain), had but done the 'ather's will, that he was now at the right hand of God, and hat he would soon come to judgment. This was the view he vas attacking; presumably this became his early message. We ometimes fail to realize that Paul was not converted to Paulin- sm. Many views which are written large in his epistles and vhich have been expanded and interpreted — and misinter- preted — through the years may with sober probability be scribed to his developing thought and new experiences. It hould not be forgotten that for many years after his conver- ion we know nothing about him save that he was working in yria and Cilicia. It would be interesting and probably very obering if we could discover a letter from his pen written early n those years.

Many are our debts to Paul. This is not the place to attempt o catalogue them. One may be mentioned. The more I have vorked in the field of Christian beginnings the more I have been impressed with a problem which I believe germane to this resent study: the prominence given to Jesus' death and resur- ection in Paul's teaching. As I have suggested, it seems to me tterly unlikely that the note was current in the preaching he ad heard. It apparently was his own deduction, and I think can see why.

Paul was a distinctly forthright sort of man. There was little ubtle about him. When he laid down the law to his converts bout certain abuses, it was not that he feared they would suc- umb: they already had. When he defended himself against harges, they were not charges that might be raised: they had been. And my impression is that it was on precisely those hot pots that he laid his emphasis. He was not one who knew how o retreat gracefully — advance backwards — to more strategic nd less dangerous frontiers. He was wont to fight it out on the articular front in question until the enemy surrendered. Does ot that give the clue? The cross was, as he makes very clear, o the Jews a stumblingblock, to the gentiles foolishness. And vell did he know it. "Cursed is every one that hangeth on a

tree" had probably been as much a deterrent to him as it wa to those from the synagogues whose antipathy led him throug the years to an open break — to see the law and the gospel tw opposing camps drawn up in battle array. Well and good. S be it. That was the crux? Then that was to be the message. A I have said, Paul was not one to concede a point; to change th figure, he apparently rarely stroked his nettles gently. In h Damascus days he had become convinced that Jesus had bee approved by God *although he had been crucified*; as the yea went by the conjunction changed: Jesus had been approved b God *because he had been crucified*. That appears to me the reaso that his emphasis, so often commented upon, is so severely re stricted to "Christ crucified" — and its necessary consequenc "Christ resurrected."

As I have suggested, the years following his conversion are t us silent years. We see him with a matured and articulated mes sage. It would be idle to speculate as to the steps in the proces One point appears to me highly probable. Could we read th complete history, we should probably discover that then as no the pew moulds the pulpit fully as much as the pulpit mould the pew. Of course the imperious challenge of Jesus with it insistence on repentance, and its content the impending end o the age, is distinctly changed in the Pauline gospel. That cha lenge of Jesus was particularly suited to first-century Palestin It was not acceptable to the leaders, nor is that surprising. Nev ertheless they understood it, and many in the nation hearkene with avidity although their support may not have been, whe superficially viewed, a source of noticeable strength. But in an other portion of the Græco-Roman world the message woul have fallen on deaf ears, for the Greek and the Roman, lik Gallio, cared for none of these things. Salvation, security whe anchors were dragging, hope when all that seemed secure wa tottering — that was what the gentile world wanted, and be cause of that the various salvation cults (popularly dubbed to day "mystery religions") were making progress and converts a a lively rate. The new movement, once it had been thrust out side the limits of the synagogue, was able to break away in par from its traditional past, and thus was free to answer the long

ng of men's hearts as Judaism with its heritage from the past ould never do. Of course changes came. Of course Christianty, as it eventually came to be called, became speedily a sacramental cult with a divine or semidivine Lord Jesus Christ, with sacramental bath of initiation replacing the proselyte baptism vhich apparently its first preachers had insisted upon as they ntered the broader world, with a sacramental communion meal n the course of which, or by means of which, the participant ame into very vital union with his Lord. And, of course, Christian preachers, piqued by pagan charges of borrowing, retorted hat the rival and seemingly earlier cults were actually the ones vho had borrowed, for their true originators, the demons, had ensed what was coming and had thus tried to emasculate a novement which they could not avert.

These were the tides which were running. How far out into he stream Paul had waded is open to question. That he had onsciously borrowed is utterly improbable. That his hearers, ccustomed to this type of thinking, may again and again have ead more out of his words than he had intended is not to be lenied. One thing is sure. To be understood you must speak the anguage of men. Paul translated his words from Aramaic to Greek; it is scarcely to be doubted that he translated his thoughts oo. Thus in his letters we find him with a gospel which he was preaching with power and effect. Together with the stout norality of the synagogue were many new notes, which the group in Palestine which had already incurred suspicion from rthodox Jewry and which was being forced to watch its step, iewed with not unnatural distrust and suspicion.

Paul has often been styled a theologian; some have even bedome ultralyrical in viewing him as the greatest thinker of the ges. All this seems to me utterly mistaken. Paul was prinarily interested in human conduct. His contribution, and a profound one it was, was in that sphere, not in speculative hought. A Jew to the finger tips, the problem of sin was to him f tremendous concern. His years in the gentile world had conrinced him, as it probably had most Jews, that the gentile was iopelessly mired in vice and degradation — a direct consequence f his preferring idols of the corruptible creature to the ever-

blessed Creator. But the Jew was in a similar though not identical plight. He too had justly incurred the wrath of God, was alienated from him and knew not how to return. He had the law, to be sure, but was in no less a sorry plight than was the gentile who, too, had a law in his heart. But it was as impossible for the one as for the other to be saved by the law — written or unwritten — and for the same reason: man found it impossible to obey them. Thus they stood hopeless, condemned. And all this was part of the divine plan. They could not plead the excuse of ignorance; they knew what was demanded, the one by the commands from Sinai, the other by the unwritten law which gave conscience its content, by his awareness of wrong. In fact, that was the function of law, to make man aware of his plight. Had the law not forbidden this, enjoined that, there would not have been the same dire consequence; it was transgression of the command of God that made sin sin and the sinner guilty: yet this too had its brighter side. It has a definite function. It convicts man of guilt, but, more than that, it convinces him of the hopelessness of his state. It is in short the means of his salvation. By convincing him of his hopelessness, that he is in a pit from which he cannot escape, it makes him ready to adopt, and eagerly, the means of escape which God has provided. Thus the law is the *paidagogos* — "tutor" is a singularly bad translation — to bring us to the true way of escape, that is, of reconciliation to God, namely, to Christ. It is not that this so-called "tutor" provides the first easy lessons of primary school, enabling us to be promoted. Rather, the harsh, menial, tyrannous slave has so ground man down as to make him eager and anxious to escape, to receive the freedom of forgiveness.

And this way of escape is through Christ. To understand this ultrapractical teaching of Paul one must recognize that central to his thought, at the very heart of his gospel, comes the little phrase ἐν Χριστῷ (in Christ). By faith in Christ and the power of his resurrection the Christian has become united in a very literal sense with his Lord. He has actually been joined in complete union with Christ in his baptism. In this experience there was more than met the eye. He has been baptized into Christ's death, has actually himself shared that experience. As Christ

died on the cross but was raised by the power of God, so the convert dies; the man who comes out of the water is not the old man but a new creature. He has left behind his old sinful nature, is now in very essence a new man in Christ. He has died to the flesh characterized by all its lusts and rebellion. Henceforth he lives to the spirit. A mystic change, but nonetheless a very real change, has taken place. As he has been crucified with Christ, so now Christ lives in him. The new man is thus in sober reality a Christ-man. The words "in Christ" or "Christ liveth in me" are to be understood in a very literal sense. They are for Paul far from being figures of speech. When he speaks of having the "mind of Christ," he does not mean that he thinks *like* Christ, but that Christ is really thinking in him: his words are Christ's words. Christ speaks through him. Thus in sober reality for the newborn Christian, this new experience can be described: "The love of Christ constraineth me." Not his love for Christ, still less Christ's love for him, but a love boundless in its scope, made possible only as the Christian becomes identified with his Lord, one with others who have shared the same experience comprising literally the body of Christ, and by their sufferings for the one whose they are and whom they serve fulfilling, that is, experiencing Christ's sufferings.

Thus the man who has passed through this experience and who evidences it by his "faith," that is, by the quality and character of his life — faith for Paul is far from being intellectual assent to notions however praiseworthy; it is a quality of life. The "faith" of the Christian is thus the new life he is living in Christ; the life that Christ is living in him; better yet the new life that is being lived by the new-born Christ-man — the man who has passed through that redemptive experience finds himself in a new world, a world of peace. No longer is he alienated from God, kicking at the goads of life. Instead he finds himself loving the things that God loves, hating the things that God hates — in a word, at peace with God. And that is proof positive that he now stands in his proper relation to God, forgiven, acquitted, whatever term you choose. The agelong antagonism is over; he is at peace with God the Father.

This righteousness, sense of forgiveness is not something im-

parted to him or imputed to him. No man is made to *merit* salvation; still less is he so regarded by God on the basis of questionable bookkeeping or the juggling of credits. Rather, through this great redemptive process the change in the man himself has been made. The old man who stood fettered fast by his guilt is no more to be found; a miracle of grace has taken place, that man has died; in his place stands one who can approach the Father with confidence and need fear no future assize, provided — Paul is always the practical teacher — provided his quality of life evidences that he is "in Christ," is at peace with God. Woe betide him if he say: "Since this experience entails abounding grace, shall I not continue to sin that grace may become still more abundant?" Such an attitude would but evidence that he was but a living lie.

At once the chilling voice of logic makes itself heard. Paul, we say, is riding two horses at once. Why if this divine economy prevails, why if the newborn Christian finds streaming into him from Christ, who himself is love, this new Christ-love, which has freed him and yet which makes him the slave of the one who has set him free, why does Paul give himself concern about his converts? Why give especial advice to those who are faltering? How can they falter? Once again we find the age-old dilemma: theory and practical experience. Logically his admonitions and sharply defined rules of conduct were quite unnecessary. He who was in Christ would have supplied by the Spirit all the necessary insight and help; would feel himself borne along in the great current streaming from Christ. Yet on every side he saw Christians whose conduct he disapproved. By precept and example he sought to help and encourage those who, while in Christ, were yet but babes in Christ. The fallacy is obvious; it would be pointless to try to explain it away.

And another query arises. How in Paul's thinking did Christ's death save us? And on that question and its various answers many strange structures have been raised. To what extent this question bulked large for Paul is hard to say. Nowhere does he discuss the saving efficacy of the death of Christ as a subject in itself. In the constantly debated Rom. 3:21 ff. he is not concerned with the cross in itself; rather we have a very brief state-

ment as to the place of the cross — its necessity in terms of divine justice — in relation to the divine pardon. *That* Christ's death saved us was certain; *how* is far less clear. His letters are letters, not treatises. Perhaps this point was so significant that in his oral instruction he had made himself clear. Personally I doubt it. After all, Paul is not the careful theologian he has so often been acclaimed. He reached his answers because he knew his answers. And yet in one brief passage (Gal. 3:10–14) he may give the clue, probably better said, *a* clue.

As his argument proceeds, he sounds the note that has always scandalized Judaism, because of the total suppression of the *sine qua non* repentance: "Cursed is everyone who continueth not in all things that are written in the book of the law, to do them." This challenge to the legalist,

> Thus your state is hopeless. You cannot hope to escape this failure; hence your confidence, "He that doeth them shall live in them," is void, for none can do them all,

leads him to the thorny word, "Christ delivered us from the curse of the law, having become a curse for us; for it stands written, 'Cursed is everyone that hangeth on a tree.'" This word *delivered* (ἐξηγόρασεν), unfortunately translated *redeemed* or *purchased*,[3] was to lead to all sorts of extravagant and vicious speculations, from the consequences of which we have not yet entirely escaped. This fancied intimation of purchase, together with the phrase λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν,[4] ascribed to Jesus (whether in consequence of some sort of dependence upon this verse or view is not clear), gave seeming support to the view that was to hold almost unrivaled sway for centuries of a ransom paid to the devil. That Paul had any such notion is utterly unlikely. The most that can be read into the word — and the same applies to ἀπολύτρωσις in Rom. 3:24 — is that of setting a captive free. What apparently he meant was that the curse which the law pronounced [5] has lost its power through Christ. He has rescued

[3] Marcion apparently read ἠγόρασεν and argued that Christ had bought us from the demiurge with his own life, his only commodity. Epiphanius indignantly and heatedly accuses Marcion of wickedly twisting the apostle's word (Panarion 42, 8).

[4] Mark 10:45 = Matt. 20:28; cf. I Tim. 2:6.

[5] That is, upon all Jews (cf. ἡμᾶς in contrast to τὰ ἔθνη in the next verse).

us. He came under its curse, not through disobedience but through suffering the death of a criminal on the cross, which made him "accursed," as Deut. 21:23 proves. It was not that he was crucified because he was accursed, but he became accursed according to the standards of the law because he was crucified. Thus by this act he came under the curse of the law and thereby was put outside the pale of the law. It had passed its sentence; he was no longer subject to it. We come into union with him, one outside the power of the law; thus we too are untouched by it. He has rescued us from its power by himself becoming outside its power. Just as it ceased to be significant for him, so it has ceased to be significant for us also, for we are in Christ.

And yet Paul is insistent that this involved no moral laxness on the part of God, no treating as innocent those who were not. All men, Jew and gentile alike, were hopelessly involved in sin. They had incurred death, and they had no excuse. Only a *deus ex machina* solution was possible. This had been achieved, as we have seen, by the death of Christ, but in a way that must make very clear that sin involved dreadful consequences. Thus in Paul, as we know him, the crucifixion is no longer simply a horrid crime by men. It is part of God's plan.

From one angle all this is somewhat akin to the view in the other salvation cults that the redeemer god had himself learned the way of salvation through suffering and death and had left the secret behind to be appropriated by his initiates. From another angle it is very different. With his heritage of moral concern this way of deliverance must meet squarely the problem that the guilty should die. God had not pulled the noose earlier; instead he had waited until now, i.e., till the end of the age—Paul in essence was an apocalyptist; he thought the world was going to end on the morrow although, confronted with wayward churches only too eager to imbibe that intoxicating draught, he taught as if it were to last forever — to provide a complete means of escape to those who would take it, who were aware now of the desperateness of their plight, and at the same time to demonstrate that his seeming delay had not been due to indifference or inability. Instead it was due to kindness, but it was kindness that involved a heavy price — the death of the innocent: "For

while we were yet weak, in due season Christ died for the ungodly." Just as Gal. 3:7–14 was couched in language that led later readers to find convenient support for their theories of ransom and purchase, so in this emphasis on the justice of God in Romans 3 was to be discovered proof positive of the so-called governmental view. And in addition, such phrases as διὰ τῆς ἀπολυτρώσεως τῆς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ and ἱλαστήριον ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἵματι (especially when the phrase ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἵματι was mistakenly made dependent upon the intervening word διὰ πίστεως), reminiscent of the piacular victims in the cult of the temple, could not fail to obscure a much more important confidence. Paul was a Jew; his ethical insights were as clear as his speculative and pseudophilosophical explanations were muddy.

The more I study Paul the less satisfied I am with many of his arguments. The impression I constantly receive is that of a boy working algebraic equations. Equation II grows out of I, III out of II, occasionally IV out of III; then comes a hitch. How V could grow out of IV it is impossible to see; but jumping that hurdle, there is no further problem: VI grows from V, and in VII the conclusion is reached: $x = a$, the correct answer. Many is the algebraic paper of that sort I have corrected. Nor is the answer far to seek. Having gone as far as he could, the enterprising student had recourse to a book of answers. His two last equations were solid (even if not illuminating), for they were worked backward from the correct answer. But the intervening step was never made. This is by no means a perfect metaphor, and yet there is truth in it. Paul knew the answer he wished to achieve, and achieve it he did. That by our union with Christ we are brought into peace with God, where we are freed from the law's demands, he was convinced: he had himself experienced it. That Christ had in consequence of his obedience to death been exalted by God to his proper status he was also convinced. The one whom he had formerly believed accursed had not been so regarded by God. Instead, since his resurrection from the dead he had been plainly designated, and rightly, God's son in accord with his spirit which was in essence holiness itself.[6] These great certainties he cherished. But Paul's was not a coldly

[6] Rom. 1:4.

logical mind. His arguments are full of loopholes. It takes little daring to see many a critic in his own day able to point out conspicuous *non sequiturs*. He had a message that dominated his life; he was under obligation to God to preach it to men. It was the gift of life; men were dying without it. There is thus always a note of urgency, of insistence; there is no time for niceties or overexactnesses. Any means that would enable him to reach men, to win them for Christ, he would use. As with himself and other men, so also with ideas and arguments he did not indulge in shadowboxing; instead he gave body blows. If phrases, even ideas, would not fit into place easily; so much the worse for the phrases, so much the worse for the ideas. But his honesty and his integrity and his insight that what was necessary was not a creed or a belief but a new quality of life — clean, courageous, and radiant — these are to be reckoned as mighty assets in the ledger of life. Many of his phrases and ideas we would not longer heed if they had not been made sacrosanct in Holy Writ; many of them were destined to be employed in ways he never dreamed and would have bitterly attacked. In many ways he has changed the course of Christian thinking; his gospel was vastly different from that of the one he preached. But like that one, he, too, sounded a commanding summons to a life of sacrificial devotion which would bring its own blessedness. The tragedy is that for both Paul and Jesus words which may in sober literalness be styled "words of life" have through the years been turned into just one more escape device so that believers might be free to live at ease instead of bearing the cross which, at least by implication, both Jesus and Paul apparently called them to bear

Already this paper has grown far beyond the limits I had originally set. I had planned to consider in some detail the book of Hebrews and its incidental figures of sacrifice and of the Galilean peasant in the rôle of an eternal high priest offering his own blood once and for all. That must be left to my critics, many of whom will probably be most dissatisfied with the picture I have drawn. I have spoken at times unqualifiedly about matters where opinions may very well differ. I presume that it is not necessary to remark that my silence on these and

other matters is not always to be interpreted as due to ignorance or to oversight.

That God has redeemed man through Jesus Christ is a common theme in the New Testament; but after all, little is clear save the universal conviction that it is *by* God not *from* God. Many have found clear-cut and ordered plans or doctrines of salvation recorded in its pages. Frankly, I fail to discover them. A rapidly developing Christology in which the one content as a prophet of God to herald the dawn of a new age was raised to a prominence that required little bridging to the pronouncements of the creeds — yes. As men hungered for salvation, redemption, they fancied they had found it; and the eventually increasing emphasis on Christ in terms of creation — the emphasis that surely would have startled him, could he have heard it — suggests that there was but little question that the source of redemption was the same as the source of creation — all this is to be seen. Perhaps this is as it should be. Undoubtedly most will scout any query here. And that insights have been achieved, without which we should be distinctly the poorer, I would not for an instant deny. Nevertheless I must confess at the end, as I hinted at the beginning, that I have the uncomfortable feeling that in it all man has suffered a definite loss; that there is still a place for that stalwart word of Paul, torn from its context and unqualified by the thoroughly orthodox and certainly easier conclusion which he gave to it: "Work out your own salvation with fear and trembling."

PAGAN DIVINE SERVICE IN LATE ANTIQUITY

MARTIN P. NILSSON

Lund University, Sweden

Sometimes it is said that it would not have mattered much whether Christianity had won or not, the result would have been much the same, for the spiritual background of the time was the same. I leave this opinion to be judged on its own merits and turn to a side of religion in which the difference between Paganism and Christianity is thought to be thoroughgoing, the cult. That is to say, the cult of the gods, for the similarities between the cult of the Saints and martyrs and that of the dead and heroes are striking and well known through the work of Lucius.[1] Shrines were built for the Saints, votive offerings brought, and even animals slaughtered just as for the heroes, food was placed and drink poured out on their graves and banquets held on them just as on the graves of the pagan dead. This is mentioned in the epigrams attributed to Gregory of Nazianzen and was more frequent in the Western part of the Empire, but it must have been common in the East too, for the custom of holding meals in churchyards on the *Psychosabbaton*, the Saturday before Whitsunday, is widespread in the Greek Church to this day.[2]

But the cult of the Christian God is supposed to be separated from the cult of pagan gods by a wide gulf. Animal sacrifice, which is rightly said to be the characteristic rite of the pagan cult, was detested by the Christians. This aversion was a chief point in the conflict of religions. But we ought to make the circumstances clear. Animal sacrifice was fairly expensive and took place on special occasions only, at the yearly festivals of the gods and at joyous events in the family; there almost every slaughtering of an animal was made in the form of a sacrifice,

[1] E. Lucius, Die Anfänge des Heiligenkults, 1904, esp. p. 288 ff.

[2] E. Dyggve, A Sarcophagus Lid with a Tricliniarch in "From the Collections of Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek, III, 1942, p. 237, fig. 12 is an interesting photograph from Herzegovina of a meal on a grave.

so that the word φιλοθύτης got the significance "who is fond of guests." Here was the main stumbling-block for Christians, they could not take part in the joyous feasts of their pagan friends,[3] and even if they bought their meat in a butcher's shop there was a great risk that it was εἰδωλόθυτον, came from a ritually sacrificed animal.

In Greek religion there was also a monthly cult, especially the cult of Apollo and the house cult; [4] yet as far as is known animal sacrifice did not occur in this, rather offerings of a less pretentious kind. It might seem to the Greeks that they venerated their gods too rarely, bringing offerings to them generally once a year, less frequently once a month, and more often at irregular occasions; they also became acquainted with foreign cults, e.g. the Egyptian, in which there was a daily divine service, and they were impressed by it. However, in the beginning of the Hellenistic age we find the first examples of daily offerings. Theocritus wrote an epigram for a statue of cypress wood of Asclepius to which his friend, the surgeon Nicias, daily offered frankincense.[5] Another instance comes from the ruler cult. An inscription from Elaea [6] prescribes that the priest of the king Attalos III shall bring an offering of frankincense daily to the altar of Zeus Soter. Another inscription from Teos from the beginning of the Roman age, according to the brilliant restoration of L. Robert,[7] prescribes that a hymn shall be sung every morning at the opening of the temple of Dionysos by the priest, the ephebes, and 'the priest of the boys': incense is to be burned and libations poured out and lamps lighted daily by the priest of the Emperor at the opening as well as at the closing of the temple.

In the time of Pausanias daily divine service was known.

[3] Lent should be viewed from this aspect. It is abstinence from meat (Greek νηστεία, the etymology of 'carneval' from *carne vale* is probably right) and originally not a piece of asceticism but a token of sorrow, meat being reserved for feast-meals. The Lent of 40 days before Easter was already common before the Council at Nicaea in 327 A.D.

[4] Clearchus from Methydrion (Theopomp. in Porphyr, de abst., II, 16).

[5] Anthol. pal., VI, 337.

[6] OGI, 332.

[7] CIG, 3062; L. Robert, Études anatoliennes, p. 20 ff.

aily offerings were brought to Zeus in Olympia [8] and Pausanias entions two other instances of daily cult.[9] Here we find offer-gs and forms of the cult which could be performed daily. lthough little known, such rites are of so great an interest that brief survey may be appropriate; for they were increasingly idespread in late antiquity and brought about a great change Greek cult. Animal sacrifice was not the dominating rite. Incense was always popular with the Greeks, but its use be-ame much more common in the Hellenistic and Roman age, o doubt because the import was more effective and the supply cher. Arnobius says: *sine ture religionis officium claudicat*,[10] nd the Geoponica asserts that the gods enjoy frankincense ore than gold.[11] In the Orphic hymn-book there is appended each hymn a note, specifying the kind of incense to be used. Together with incense goes the lamp. In ancient Greece the rch rather than the lamp was used in rites, but lamps were rought as votive offerings, especially in the cult of Demeter.[12] he comic poet Plato says that *daimones* do not love the smell the lamp.[13] In the Oriental and Egyptian cults the lamp was uch used, and many lamps are found in the shrines of the gyptian gods at Delos, Eretria, and Pompeii. It is related at lamps burned in the temple of Zeus Panamaros at Stra-nicea in Caria in spite of the attacks of the enemies in 40 B.C.[14] the accounts of the temple of Jupiter Capitolinus at Arsinoe Egypt of 215 A.D. a sum paid for oil for the lamps is regu-rly entered.[15] The lamp appears in the Emperor Cult and in omestic worship. It was very common in the rustic cults in oves and at fountains; in the cave of the Nymphs on Mt. rnes and in that at Vari on Mt. Hymettus hundreds of lamps e found which are of late types. The Christians took over the rning of incense and the lighting of lamps; lamps were lighted

[8] Paus., v, 13, 10; the *theokoloi* in the lists of cult-attendants from 36 B.C. to 265 A.D., chriften von Olympia, 59 ff.

[9] Both with curious aetiological stories, Paus., vii, 23, 11 and ix, 34, 2.

[10] Arnob., adv. nat. VII, 26.

[11] Geopon., XI, 15.

[12] I have collected some instances, Gött. gel. Anz., 1916, p. 49 ff., to which now ch can be added.

[13] Fragm. 174. 15 Kock (i p. 648).

[14] P. Roussel, Le miracle de Zeus Panamaros, Bull. corr. hell., LV, 1931, p. 70 ff.

[15] Hermes, XX, 1885, p. 430 ff.

on joyous occasions, especially on New Year's day, and ev on the graves in spite of the prohibition of the synods. Bo customs persist to this day. The Church inherited them fro the pagan cult.

Hymns in honor of the gods were always chanted at certa festivals, at extraordinary occasions, and in the agones, which religion went into the background. In the Roman a choruses were organized for regular performances. The hyr nodoi in the cult of the Emperors in Asia Minor are best know they received contributions from public money and membe ship therein was sometimes hereditary. Especially importa is a long inscription concerning the hymnodoi of Pergamon There were men or women hymnodoi (called by that name by some cognate) in many cults, in those of the Ephesi Artemis,[17] the Syrian goddess Belela,[18] Dionysus Breiseus Smyrna,[19] Demeter at Pergamon,[20] and Demeter at Eleusis; of Asclepius more will be said presently. These choruses we expensive, however, and the cities tried to diminish the cos by calling upon the ephebes to sing the hymns. This was co venient because the ephebes were often called upon to take pa in cult performances. This happened at Ephesus.[22] Most i teresting is a long inscription from Stratonicea in Caria,[23] whi prescribes that boys are to be selected who, in white ga ments with wreaths on their heads and boughs in their hand shall together with the paidophylakes be conducted by t paidonomos to the council house, where images of Zeus Pan maros and Hecate, the gods of the city, are placed; they are be accompanied by a cither player and a herald and are to si a hymn to these gods. This is very reminiscent of morni prayer in our schools and colleges.

[16] Inschr. von Pergamon, 374. See Ziebarth's article in the Realencycl.; J. Keil Österr. Jahreshefte, XI, 1908, p. 101 ff.; Ch. Picard, Ephèse et Claros, p. 251 ff.

[17] The inscription of Vibius Salutaris, Ephesos, II, No. 27, p. 127 ff., B l. 146, a Österr. Jahresh., l.c., p. 107.

[18] SIG³, 1111. [19] CIG, 3160.

[20] Athen. Mitt., XXXV, 1910, No. 40, p. 457, and XXXVII, 1912, No. 16, p. 28

[21] Inscription of the dadouch Themistokles, J. Chr. Threpsiades in K. Kourouniot ΕΛΕΥΣΙΝΙΑΚΑ, I, p. 223 ff.; Pollux, I, 35.

[22] Edict of the proconsul Persicus, Ephesos, II, No. 21 and 22, p. 115 ff.

[23] CIG, 2715 a; L. Robert, l.c., p. 516 ff.

The issue appears in a letter of the Emperor Julian. He writes: "You shall learn the hymns to the Gods by heart. There are many beautiful hymns composed by old as well as by recent poets. You shall try to understand those which are sung in the temples. Most of them were given by the gods in answer to prayer while some few are composed thanks to divine inspiration and souls unstained by evil in honor of the gods," and in another letter to the prefect of Egypt he orders him to take care of sacred music.[24]

To the hymns were added speeches in honor of the gods, and it may not be inappropriate to call these sermons. Such are e.g. certain speeches of Aristides Rhetor, who also composed hymns.[25] The office of the hymnodos mentioned in some inscriptions from Asia Minor can hardly have been other than one praising the gods in such speeches, even if they sometimes were women. In the mysteries of Demeter Thesmophoros at Smyrna two are mentioned and others in the cult of the Emperors at Pergamon and at Smyrna.[26] In the cult association of the Iobacchi at Athens a *theologia* was introduced, i.e. a speech in the honor of the god.[27] Alexander the Pseudo-prophet had a herald and a *theologos* summon those who came to his oracle; he knew how to make propaganda.

Those temples which were much frequented and had a fairly numerous personnel could provide for a daily divine service. Such were the temple of Dionysos at Teos, the seat of the Dionysiac technitai, and especially the temples of Asclepius who at that time was the most popular of the Greek gods. A fully story of Aelian's [28] proves that a morning hymn was regularly sung in his temples. A fighting cock at Tanagra had hurt one leg; when the morning hymn to the god was sung he placed himself in line, stretched the hurt leg forwards, and tried to

[24] Julian, Epist. ed Bidez et Cumont, No. 89 b, p. 301 D, and No. 109. Here we find even verbal inspiration; cf. the inscription of Damianus, Siebenter Bericht etc., Abhandl. der Akad. Berlin, 1911 Anhang, I, p. 64.

[25] Arist., I, p. 513 Dindorf; a hymn to Asclepius preserved in a mutilated inscription attributed to him, R. Herzog, Sitz. Ber. der Akad. Berlin, 1934, p. 753 ff.

[26] CIG, 3199; 3148; Inschr. v. Pergamon, 374.

[27] IG, II², 1368 (SIG³, 1109), l. 115.

[28] Aelian fragm. 98.

sing with the chorus as well as he could. When Aristide Rhetor dreamed that he heard the boys sing early in the morn ing,[29] this refers probably to the morning hymn in the Asclepi eum at Pergamon. An inscription, preserved at Cassel whic probably comes from Athens,[30] has a collection of hymns be ginning with a morning hymn to Asclepius: "wake up As clepius, ruler of the peoples, cast the sleep from thy eyes . . wake up and hear thy hymn!" Hymns to Hygieia and Teles phorus follow. A similar collection of hymns is preserved i an inscription from Epidaurus.[31] The beginning is lost bu above the third hymn is written ὥρᾳ τρίτηι, 'at the third hour' consequently the editors supply above the first hymn, whic praises Hygieia, the words ὥρᾳ πρώτηι; it was of course th morning hymn.

The singing of hymns in the cult of Asclepius at certain hour of the day recalls the *horae canonicae* of the Christian liturg which are mentioned by Tertullian and Clemens Alexandrinu already and the Cathemerinon of Prudentius which contain hymns to be sung at cock crow, in the morning, before and afte the meals, in the evening, and on going to bed.[32]

Not only were hymns sung but other daily rites also wer performed in the temple at Epidaurus. Another inscription [3] contains a liturgical ordinance; because of its singular impor tance it is much to be regretted that its state of extreme mutila tion permits little to be made out. First there are certain pre scriptions for a πυρφόρος, a fire-bearer who has to make th round of the altars and to do something in the Metroum an Aphrodisium, probably to kindle fire for incense; then lamp are mentioned. To this service we should probably relate th signs incised in the beginning of the fourth century A.D. o numerous altars in the sanctuary, a circle with the symbol o a god and a number.[34] A new paragraph begins with evenin libations and mentions a priest, someone who is seated on

[29] Arist., I, p. 453 Dindorf.

[30] IG, II², 4533.

[31] IG, IV: 1², 132–134.

[32] L. Duchesne, Origines du culte chrétien, p. 467 ff.

[33] IG, IV: 1², 742.

[34] See the list in IG, IV: 1², p. 173 ff.: cf. IG, IV¹, p. 186 f., etc.

throne, an incense-burning stand, Apollo, Asclepius, unmixed wine and finally the Anakes. We have the sorely mutilated fragments of a richly developed ritual of which we should like to know the whole.

The information related above gives us an idea of the liturgy in the great sanctuary of Epidaurus. The day began with a morning hymn, a fire-bearer went round the altars, probably to burn incense (any other sacrifice is hardly thinkable). Lamps were lighted. At the third hour again a hymn was chanted and probably at other hours of the day too. Some rites were performed the character of which we do not know precisely because of the mutilated state of the inscription. The day ended with an evening hymn. We may guess that in Epidaurus too a *theologos* on certain feast-days gave a sermon praising the god and his services. A similar ritual existed in other temples, e.g. that of Dionysos at Teos.

Certainly this ritual impressed people and seemed to them to be a more appropriate veneration of the gods than animal sacrifice which took place but rarely and at irregular intervals. This elaborate ritual resembles very closely that of the Catholic Church, the *horae canonicae*, the lamps, the burning of incense, the sermon on feast-days, i.e. Sundays. Sunday is a Jewish heritage, even if the day was changed, which pagan worship did not accept. The similarity between pagan and Christian divine service is greater than is generally thought, but there are profound differences too. In this article I have wished to draw attention to similarities which have been little observed up to now.

PEPYS, FULLER AND AN ARCHBISHOP

Among young Samuel Pepys's many acquaintances was Thomas Fuller, antiquary, historian, preacher, biographer and wit. Fuller died on August 16, 1661, but he had previously appeared more than once in the Diary.[1] On May 17, 1660, Pepys had a rapturously busy time at court: "After that, going to see the Queen of Bohemia, I met with Dr. Fuller, whom I sent to a tavern with Mr. Edw. Pickering, while I and the rest went to see the Queen. . . ." [2] Early the next year (January 5, 1661), "Several people came to me about business, among others the great Tom Fuller, who came to desire a kindness for a friend of his . . . which I promised to do." [3] Later in the month (January 22) "I met with Dr. Thomas Fuller and took him to the Dog, where he tells me of his last and great book that is coming out: that is, his History of all the Families in England; and could tell me more of my own, than I knew myself." [4] In the same conversation Fuller talked with great complacence and detail about his own feats of memory.[5] Twice Pepys heard Fuller preach: the first time (February 3, 1661), he commended a point made by the speaker,[6] but on May 12, 1661, he was forced to admit, "methought it was a poor dry sermon." [7] He heard of Fuller's death, "of a sort of fever" then prevalent, on the day it occurred, and called him "the famous Tom Fuller." [8]

The one of Fuller's numerous books dearest to Pepys's heart was The Church-History of Britain; from the Birth of Jesus Christ, Untill the Year M. DC. XLVIII (London, 1655), the only ecclesiastical history of repute which is intentionally amusing. We find him reading it in a book stall in Paul's Churchyard for an hour or two on February 15, 1660.[9] By October 7th he had bought himself a copy,[10] and from

[1] Ed. H. B. Wheatley, 9 vols. (London, 1896–1899).

[2] I, 135.

[3] I, 295–296.

[4] I, 308.

[5] Some years after (July 14, 1667) Pepys was to hear about Fuller's marvellous memory from a less prejudiced source (VII, 22).

[6] I, 315.

[7] II, 32.

[8] II, 77.

[9] I, 55.

[10] I, 238.

then on it was a favorite bed-time and Lord's Day book.[11] The most interesting entry concerning the Church History comes on October 11, 1663:

> At night fell to reading in the Church History of Fuller's, and particularly Cranmer's letter to Queen Elizabeth, which pleases me mightily for his zeal, obedience, and boldness in a cause of religion.[12]

Wheatley's note is as follows:

> Lord Braybrooke added (*sic*) after the words "Queen Elizabeth," and it is not easy to know what Pepys meant. A reference to the "Church History" does not throw any light upon the matter.

In point of fact, the Church History gives us all the light that is necessary, and by it we see something extremely odd: the methodical and exact Pepys getting a name wrong. Clearly, Cranmer did not write to Queen Elizabeth, and none of his extant letters to any ruler exhibit a notable combination of "zeal, obedience and boldness." We must, therefore, look for another letter-writing ecclesiastic, preferably an archbishop, to match Cranmer's rank, and we need have no fear in identifying our man as Edmund Grindal, archbishop of Canterbury in name, at least, from 1575 until his death in 1583. Grindal was in the queen's ill favor for very nearly all of his incumbency, and he showed a recalcitrancy toward the royal wishes which was by no means characteristic of Elizabeth's officials, civic or clerical. On December 20, 1576, he wrote her a noble letter which Fuller, misdating it 1580, prints in his Church History.[13] At the very end of the letter comes this passage:

> But I trust in God your Majesty will alwayes humble your self under his mighty hand, and goe forward in the godly and zealous setting forth of Gods true religion, alwayes yeilding true obedience and reverence to the word of God, the only rule of faith and religion.[14]

Fuller's comment is enthusiastic:

> What could be written with more spirit, and less animosity? more humility and less dejection? I see a *Lambe* in his own, can be a *Lion*, in God, and his

[11] I, 276, 288, 291; III, 279, 312; V, 424; VI, 195; VII, 188.

[12] III, 279.

[13] Bk. ix, sec. iv ([Vol. II], 123–130); ed. J. S. Brewer, 6 vols. (Oxford, 1845), IV, 435–454. See also John Strype, The History of the Life and Acts of . . . Edmund Grindal (Oxford, 1821), pp. 329–333, 528–574; The Remains of Edmund Grindal, ed. William Nicholson (Parker Society, Cambridge, 1843), pp. 376–390.

[14] Pp. 129–130.

churches Cause. Say not that *orbitas* and *senectus*, (the two things which made the man speak so boldly to the Tyrant) only encouraged *Grindall* in this his writing, whose necessary boldness did arise, partly from confidence in the goodness of the cause, for which, partly from the graciousness of the Queen to whom he made his address. But, alas! all in vain. . . .[15]

Can there be any doubt but that these lines were fresh in Pepys's mind when he made the entry in his diary. How his usually accurate mind and pen came to slip and record "Cranmer" for "Grindal" can hardly be explained by us.

[15] P. 130.

B. J. Whiting

Harvard University

BOOKS RECEIVED

According to Paul. *By Harris Franklin Rall.* New York, Scribner, 1944. xv, 272 p. $2.75.

The American Jewish Year Book, 5705; September 18, 1944 to September 7, 1945; Volume 46. *Edited for The American Jewish Committee by Harry Schneiderman.* Philadelphia, The Jewish Publication Society of America, 5705–1944. xxx, 620 p. [n.p.]

The Children of Light and The Children of Darkness; a Vindication of Democracy and a Critique of Its Traditional Defence. *By Reinhold Niebuhr.* New York, Scribner, 1944. xiii, 190 p. $2.00.

The Constant Fire. *By Allan Knight Chalmers.* New York, Scribner, 1944. viii, 172 p. $2.00.

Germany's Stepchildren. *By Solomon Liptzin.* Philadelphia, The Jewish Publication Society of America, 5704–1944. 298 p. $3.00.

Highroads of the Universe; an Introduction to Christian Philosophy. *By J. Glover Johnson.* New York, Scribner, 1944. xiv, 316 p. $2.50.

A Panorama of Prejudice. *By Harry Cohen.* New York, Bloch Publishing Company, 1944. 150 p. $2.00.

Sabbath, the Day of Delight. *By Abraham E. Millgram.* Philadelphia, The Jewish Publication Society of America, 5705–1944. xxx, 495 p. $3.00.

Toward Larger Living; Sermons on Personal Religion. *By Dana McLean Greeley.* Boston, Beacon Press, 1944. 103 p. $1.25.

Under Orders; the Autobiography of William Laurence Sullivan. New York, Richard R. Smith, 1944. 200 p. $2.50.

The Way to Freedom; a Contribution to the Struggle of the Jews for Their Right to Live as Free Men and a Free People. *By Meyer Edelbaum.* New York, Bloch Publishing Company, 1944. 284 p. $2.50.

Conservation of Scholarly Journals

The American Library Association created this last year the Committee on Aid to Libraries in War Areas, headed by John R. Russell, the Librarian of the University of Rochester. The Committee is faced with numerous serious problems and hopes that American scholars and scientists will be of considerable aid in the solution of one of these problems.

One of the most difficult tasks in library reconstruction after the first World War was that of completing foreign institutional sets of American scholarly, scientific, and technical periodicals. The attempt to avoid a duplication of that situation is now the concern of the Committee.

Many sets of journals will be broken by the financial inability of the institutions to renew subscriptions. As far as possible they will be completed from a stock of periodicals being purchased by the Committee. Many more will have been broken through mail difficulties and loss of shipments, while still other sets will have disappeared in the destruction of libraries. The size of the eventual demand is impossible to estimate, but requests received by the Committee already give evidence that it will be enormous.

With an imminent paper shortage attempts are being made to collect old periodicals for pulp. Fearing this possible reduction in the already limited supply of scholarly and scientific journals, the Committee hopes to enlist the coöperation of subscribers to this journal in preventing the sacrifice of this type of material to the pulp demand. It is scarcely necessary to mention the appreciation of foreign institutions and scholars for this activity.

Questions concerning the project or concerning the value of particular periodicals to the project should be directed to Wayne M. Hartwell, Executive Assistant to the Committee on Aid to Libraries in War Areas, Rush Rhees Library, University of Rochester, Rochester, New York.

PRINTED BY THE HARVARD UNIVERSITY PRINTING OFFICE
CAMBRIDGE, MASS., U.S.A.